

Lilies That Fester...

Ralph McInerny

READING ABOUT Karl Jansky's and Grote Reber's pioneer work with makeshift radio telescopes puts one in mind of Aristotle's remark that it was wonder that first led men to philosophize. Among the first things wondered about were celestial phenomena.

Knowledge of the stars was useful for navigation — Thales wrote a book about it — but it was and is easy simply to marvel at the starry skies above, at solar and lunar eclipses, at falling stars. There isn't much else you can do about such things but know them.

Those of us blessed to live our lives as scholars — etymologically, at least, the leisure class — grow jaded with the years, alas. Others who hear us lamenting our life might think we were Volga boatmen. I suppose it is teaching more than anything else that enables us to recapture the fervor with which we began, to remember what it was like to read a Platonic dialogue for the first time, or the magnificent opening chapter of the *Metaphysics*.

A good thing gone bad is a terrible sight and the better it is the worse the sight. Or smell. "Lilies that fester smell worse than weeds." Ingratitude and lapses of zeal aside, things are going badly in the various disciplines. The programs of our learned societies are now sufficiently prurient to be noticed by newspapers. To hear that a scholar will speak on Chinese homosexual pirates in the 17th century pricks the ear. I recently read an article in the newsletter of the APA which began, "I am a 47 year old lesbian who teaches philosophy and I have a beard." The ivory tower has become Fawltly Towers.

Once at a Bouchercon — a mystery writers meeting — I listened to a paper devoted to a half dozen stories pseudonymously published in *Black Mask* in the late 1930's. Who was the author? The speaker was perfectly serious. It seemed a parody of scholarship. There was nothing intrinsically important about the stories, to have identified the author would have been to match two forgotten names. Too many papers at the APA and other learned societies — one is too many — seem equally fatuous. The mainstream has become polluted.

In times like these, Catholic scholars should represent an alternative to the degradation of the pursuit of truth. Non-Catholic universities, riddled with PC and the new Puritanism — smoke-free! — provide no model for our institutions. If we continue to ape them, some Gibbon will chronicle our fall. ✘

O Timothee, depositum custodi, devitans profanas vocum novitates et oppositiones falsi nominis scientiae, quam quidam profitentes circa fidem aberraverunt. Gratia vobiscum. 1 ad Timotheum 6

Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Newsletter

VOLUME 16, NUMBER 2

MARCH 1993

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL: Lilies That Fester 1

ARTICLES:

Considerations Against the Adoption
of Inclusive Language in Scripture
and the Liturgy 2

Eppur si muove: The Legend of Galileo 7

Right or Wrong 10

SPECIAL FEATURE:

Unifying the Divided Magisterium 12

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR 33

AROUND THE CHURCH
IN THE '90s 33

OF INTEREST 40

BOOKS RECEIVED 41

RECENT PUBLICATIONS
BY MEMBERS 41

BOOK REVIEWS 42

Considerations Against the Adoption of Inclusive Language in Scripture and the Liturgy

Rev. Robert Sokolowski
School of Philosophy
The Catholic University of America

IT HAS BEEN CLAIMED that the Church's English lectionary and liturgical prayers used in the United States should be reformulated in gender-inclusive terms. The motivation for this change is pastoral; it reflects the opinion of some people that traditional forms of English are unjust and offensive to women. But the validity of this opinion and the pastoral value of such a change are questionable, and such a revision of the Church's prayer and Scriptures involves many serious difficulties; it conflicts with the duty of the Church to hand on what it has received, it threatens to fragment the unity of the prayer of the universal Church, it deprives Church belief of some necessary linguistic resources, and it violates the organic structure of the English language. The following are some considerations against introducing gender-inclusive language in the lectionary and liturgy.

I. Changing the Text of Scripture

The proposed new lectionary involves a radical departure from translations of the Scriptures in

the past. Translations hitherto have striven to reproduce the official biblical texts, not to change them. In the present case, it is proposed that the Scriptures be systematically modified in view of a current mode of thinking. The words of Scripture are going to be changed ("improved") because of convictions about language and gender that have arisen among certain groups in the past decade or so. In the history of the Church, has there ever been any other attempt to rewrite Scripture in such a comprehensive and deliberate way? Such an action should not be done without precedent. It has to be justified and arguments for it have to be given.

Do the bishops even have the authority to change the words of Scripture in this way? Whether they do is questionable; one might argue that they do not. It is their obligation to hand on undistorted what they have received. The bishops are successors of the Apostles, not successors of the Evangelists. No one knows what the Evangelists would have written if they were alive now; all we do know is what they did in fact write. The faithful have a right to hear the word of God as it was written, not as it has been systematically and deliberately interpreted by people who have a certain ideological point of view.

The inclusive language lectionary will use the very words of Scripture as an instrument to promote a certain ideology, a point of view that is by no means agreed upon by everyone. The impression will be given that Scripture authorizes the ideology supporting such language. Should the words of Scripture be exploited in this utilitarian way?

II. Acceleration of Liturgical Changes

The proposed new lectionary must be seen against the historical development of the changes in the liturgy that have taken place

The words of Scripture are going to be changed ("improved") because of convictions about language and gender that have arisen among certain groups in the past decade or so.

since the Second Vatican Council. So far, we have had one major change, the change into the new rite and the vernacular that was authorized by Pope Paul VI. We should not underestimate the magnitude even of that change; it was a major shift in the liturgy of the Church, and it was done in a very short span of time; there was not the gradual, incremental kind of development that had been the case in previous liturgical changes.

Now, what we are faced with in the new lectionary and in the changes proposed for the liturgical prayers is a 'second wave,' so to speak, following upon the changes carried out by Pope Paul VI. The way this 'second wave' is carried out will have a very important impact on future developments; it will 'interpret' the changes under Pope Paul VI and will determine how further changes will take place in the future. If this 'second wave' radically reinterprets the words of Scripture and the prayers in the liturgy, it will very likely be taken as legitimating far more radical changes in the future, not only in America but in other countries as well. On the other hand, if at this point the Church resists such a radical change, it will show that in the future the American bishops and the bishops of other countries will have to stay close to the words of Scripture and to the common liturgy of the universal Church.

Here is a sketch of what will happen if the proposed inclusive-language changes of the lectionary and liturgy are permitted. We will have the following stages in the development of the modern liturgy:

Stage 1: The Latin, traditional liturgy is changed under Pope Paul VI into a vernacular liturgy visibly different from the liturgy that preceded it. But the extent of this change is still ambiguous. Even though the priest now faces the people and new Eucharistic prayers, derived from earlier Eucharistic prayers, are introduced, the basic structure of the Mass remains intact. This situation has prevailed for the past twenty-five years or so, which is not a long time in the history of the Church.

Stage 2: The liturgy and the words of Scripture in the lectionary are systematically modified because of a set of opinions that are prevalent in the United States. Once this is done, with something as sacred as the liturgy and the words of Scripture, a signal is given that other changes that seem urgent and 'morally compelling' can also be carried out, whether in the United States or in other countries. Thus we will in very short order move on to:

Stage 3: Masculine words are no longer used in reference to God; instead of the use of pronouns, the word 'God' is repeated over and over ("God sent God's Son to redeem God's people"); the word 'Father' is eliminated because it is patriarchal; the names for the persons of the Holy Trinity are changed to Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier. Other changes will probably come, in response to changes 'in the way we think' and in the 'sensitivities' that we have developed. These are not exaggerations; priests and people are already doing such things. Worst of all, it will be difficult to defend the traditional form of speaking and praying, because Stage 2 will have legitimated such changes in principle. What defense will the Church have against these further changes? And what other further changes will be made, in liturgical words and practice, in view of new political orders, new economic orders, new familial understandings, the new understanding of human emotions, a new acceptance of local religions, and the like?

If the American Church makes such changes, what other changes will other national Churches feel free to make? How will Rome be able to hold together the liturgy of the universal Church?

All of this is likely to happen because of the interpretation that this new step, Stage 2, will impart to the changes made in Stage 1. The gates will be opened. Everyone will be 'freed' from the constraints of remaining with the established words of Scripture and the liturgy. The 'local community' will be able to take its liturgy into its own hands. The ideology for such developments is

already in place; it needs only the official go-ahead that it is on the right track, and the inclusive lectionary and liturgy will provide such a signal.

Even the rapidity of the changes trivializes the liturgy. The interval of some twenty-five years between Stages 1 and 2 is very short. The impression given is that we are forever tinkering with the liturgy and the Scriptures. Ritual and liturgy must be solemn and have a sense of the permanent. The liturgy must present itself as being beyond the manipulation of any individual or group. Only in that way can it truly be a public prayer and only in that way can attendance at it be required of the faithful. The authority of the liturgy, the authority of Scripture, and the teaching authority of the bishops will all be severely weakened if they become perceived as being in the service of an ideology.

Even Stage 1 led to very serious abuses in the liturgy. Stage 2 is not going to put an end to changes and to demands for further tinkering; it is going to accelerate them. The Church is generating a whirlwind by this action, and since it is true that *lex orandi* is *lex credendi*, the trouble will affect the very belief of the Church.

III. A Doctrinal and Theological Need

In connection with the *lex credendi*, there are some uses of the generic word 'man' that are essential to the expression of Christian doctrine and that cannot be provided by other terms. This is especially true for expressions dealing with the mystery of the Incarnation. The proposed new translation of the Creed, for example, renders 'et homo factus est' as 'and became truly human.' But such a translation is misleading and could be taken in a monophysite sense; it could be taken to mean that the Logos merely assumed the feature or the attribute or the adjectival form of being human. 'Truly human,' as an adjectival phrase, does not convey the same unambiguous sense of substantial assumption that the noun 'man' does. After all, the incarnate Logos also became 'truly tall'

or 'truly hungry,' but he was not hypostatically united with tallness or hunger. They were only accidental to him, and to say merely that Christ was 'truly human' (and not 'man') is to leave open the possibility that his humanity too was only accidental. Only the use of the word 'man' conveys unambiguously the doctrine that the Logos assumed a substantial human nature and was hypostatically united with it.

There are many other contexts in theology and philosophy where the use of the noun 'man' is necessary to convey the sense of human nature or the human race. Such a term is necessary not only in dealing with the Incarnation, but also with the mysteries of Redemption and Grace. 'Man' as a name for a nature or a species is different from 'men and women' as names for all human beings. It is a sign of a kind of nominalism to prefer the use of 'men and women' in place of the term 'man' as a name for the human species.

IV. Disowning past Authors and the Tradition

The acceptance of inclusive language in principle will concede the claim that the traditional form of English has something morally wrong or insensitive about it, that it is somehow unjust to women. But such a position is by no means officially established by the Church; the claim that traditional English is structurally discriminatory has to be proved. It is not obvious that the traditional use of words like 'man' and 'he' in a gender-neutral way is injurious. Such usage continues to be widely accepted. There has been no official Church teaching on this matter. Instead of being argued, the claim about traditional English is simply taken for granted and then acted upon.

Furthermore, the acceptance of inclusive language will cast a shadow of immorality or insensitivity on earlier writers, even on those who wrote only a decade ago. They will be 'marked' as unjust or insensitive. Their credibility will be undermined. The changes do not simply accommodate something new, but forcefully discard the

old. This is a systematic way of disowning the past. It is also a way of disconnecting ourselves from those linguistic communities that do not incorporate such a style of writing. Thus, this step isolates the contemporary American community from its past and from the universal Church. It marks a radically new beginning and a fragmentation, at a time when the moral and religious environment is anything but healthy.

What will be done with other translations in the future? Will we have to use inclusive language in future translations of Augustine, Gregory of Nyssa, Thomas Aquinas, Theresa of Avila, and other older writers? What precedent will the acceptance of inclusive language set for future theological and religious writing? Will it lead to a prohibition of the use of traditional forms?

V. The English Language and Inclusive Terms

The major reason why such problems arise is that the move to inclusive language is not an organic development of the English language. It is an engineered change, a prosthesis, not a gradual, normal development. It is being forced on the language because of an ideology. There are several reasons why such engineered language is problematic:

(a) It is never at rest and keeps changing as the opinions of those who engineer it change. Even in inclusive language we have had many stages: at one time 's/he' was used, then 'he and she,' then 'she and he,' then the intermittent use of 'she' and 'he.' The Church's liturgy will reflect the stage at which it adopts these changes and will be out of date as soon as new developments occur. This will, of course, necessitate still more changes in the liturgy and Scripture and still more tinkering.

(b) Because they are engi-

neered, the changes do not fit normally and organically into the language. They are clumsy and awkward.

(c) Furthermore, because the changes are engineered, they draw attention to themselves. They make a point. Language generally, and liturgical language in particular, ought to be transparent; we should be directed by the language to the things and persons we are speaking about and speaking to. But the engineered changes serve as noise or static, they are intrusive, they shout and proclaim a point of view, inserted by certain people between the believer and God, between the believer and the message of faith. No one is responsible for the traditional forms of English, but a definite group and a definite point of view are expressing themselves in the engineered forms. They are imposing their will on others.

(d) Finally, an assumption behind the use of inclusive language in the liturgy is the belief that English will inevitably and definitely move toward gender-inclusive terms. The liturgy is being used to promote such a movement and to be on its cutting edge. But we cannot predict how such things will turn out; it is quite possible that the use of inclusive language will gradually die out, that the generic use of 'man' and 'he' will continue. It is quite possible that the traditional form of English will reassert itself. What will the liturgy and lectionary look like then? No one will

**Will we have to use
inclusive language
in future translations
of Augustine,
Gregory of Nyssa,
Thomas Aquinas,
Theresa of Avila,
and other
older writers?**

criticize the Church if it simply stays with the traditional language that everyone has been using until now, but it will be extremely embarrassing if the Church takes on the new trend only to find that the trend itself dies out. The change will appear frivolous, and the liturgy will have been demeaned. How could something so sacred as the liturgy and the words of Scripture have been subordinated and attached to what may turn out to be an ephemeral trend? The liturgy is not the

place for experimentation in language.

The violence done to English by the device of inclusive language calls to mind the damage done to the tradition of Christian art by the Puritans and by the participants in the French Revolution, who smashed statues and stained glass windows in a desire to make everything new; in the present case, it is the English language that is being smashed. We are dealing with an iconoclasm of language.

VI. The Legitimation of Dissent

The adoption of inclusive language legitimates and encourages dissent. In a newspaper report about the bishops' discussion concerning inclusive language, one of the arguments that was cited in favor of the changes was the claim that many people are in fact already using inclusive language in parishes and are doing a bad job of it, and therefore a better job should be done by the bishops.

To argue in such a way is to acquiesce with those who have been acting against the liturgical norms. It will encourage them to go on performing other violations, with the expectation that the official Church will gradually 'catch up' to them in these other matters as well. Of course, if the inclusive language is introduced, it will be expected that those who habitually obey the norms will comply completely with the new usage; those who wish to adhere to the traditional texts and the traditional form of English will be excluded from the liturgical community. But the disobedience of those who acted for the changes before they were approved, and the disobedience of those who promote still further changes, will have been tolerated in principle.

The Church is inviting a serious split among its members in regard to both prayer and practice by introducing inclusive language into its liturgical and Scriptural texts. ✠

THE EXAMPLE

*John Henderson, an unbeliever,
Had lately lost his Joie de Vivre
From reading far too many books.
He went about with gloomy looks;
Despair inhabited his breast
And made the man a perfect pest.
Not so his sister Mary Lunn,
She had a whacking lot of fun!
Though unbelieving as a beast
She didn't worry in the least.
But drank as hard as she was able
And sang and danced upon the table;
And when she met her brother Jack
She used to smack him on the back
So smartly as to make him jump,*

*And cry, 'What ho! You've got
the hump!'
A phrase which, more than any other,
Was gall and wormwood to her brother;
For, having an agnostic mind,
He was exceedingly refined.
The Christians, a declining band,
Would point with monitory hand
To Henderson his desperation,
To Mary Lunn her dissipation
And often mutter, 'Mark my words!'
Which came to pass: for Mary Lunn
Died suddenly, at ninety-one,
Of Psittacosis, not before
Becoming an appalling bore.*

*While Henderson, I'm glad to state,
Though naturally celibate,
Married an intellectual wife
Who made him lead the Higher life
And wouldn't give him any wine;
Whereby he fell in a decline,
And, at the writing of this,
Is suffering from Paralysis,
The which, we hear with no surprise,
Will shortly end in his demise.*

*Moral:
The moral is (it is indeed!)
You mustn't monkey with the Creed.*

—Hilaire Belloc

Eppur si muove: The Legend of Galileo

William E. Carroll

Department of History

Cornell College, Mt. Vernon, Iowa

IN A SOLEMN CEREMONY in the Sala Regia of the Vatican in October 1992, Pope John Paul II appeared before the Pontifical Academy of the Sciences to accept the findings of a commission of historical, scientific, and theological inquiry into the treatment of Galileo by the Inquisition in the seventeenth century. In 1981, the Pope established several study groups to reexamine all features of the encounter between Galileo and the Inquisition. In 1984, the Vatican published a collection of original documents related to that encounter, all but two of which had appeared in print before. The new edition provides a clear distinction among the various kinds of primary material available for scholarly research: among, for example, official decrees, internal memoranda, and committee reports.

The survival of almost all of these seventeenth century texts is the result of Napoleon's interest in Galileo. After French troops captured Rome in 1810, Napoleon asked to see three sets of documents in the Vatican archives: those concerning the medieval crusading order of the Knights Templar; the 1807 bull of excommunication of the emperor, himself; and the material on Galileo. The "Galileo codex," which Napoleon held in his hands, was itself the result of a collation made by officers of the Inquisition late in the seventeenth century, perhaps to serve as an internal reference. Napoleon ordered all of the archives of the Vatican to be transported to Paris; he hoped to create in his capital city a center for the study of European culture. Unfortunately, in the process of shipping large numbers of documents to Paris (and then several years later, after the defeat of Napo-

leon, back to Rome) many of the documents were lost. But Napoleon had the special file on Galileo sent to Paris by imperial courier. As his bibliographer in Paris remarked, Napoleon, having recently been excommunicated, saw himself as a political Galileo who, in ushering in a new order in Europe, was also persecuted by the Church..

In order to pay for the return of the archives to Rome, after the defeat of Napoleon and the restoration of the Bourbon monarchy, the Vatican's representative in Paris had to sell documents to Paris paper makers. It is difficult to know what was lost, but it seems likely that some documents from the Inquisition did not escape destruction. Despite repeated representations to the new royal government, the French refused to return the Galileo codex, in which Napoleon had taken special interest. Only in the early 1840's did the widow of an exiled government minister discover the codex in her husband's effects in Vienna, and then return it to the ambassador from the Vatican. Napoleon's fascination with Galileo, the result, no doubt, of an already well-established legend of the Italian scientist's difficulties with the Church, served to preserve the very documents which have enabled modern scholars to debunk much of the legend.

In comments before the Pontifical Academy, the Pope noted that the theologians of the Inquisition who condemned Galileo failed to distinguish properly between particular interpretations of the Bible and questions which in fact pertained to scientific investigation. According to the Pope, one of the unfortunate consequences of the condemnation of Galileo was that it has been used to reinforce the myth of an incompatibility between faith and science: "A tragic mutual incomprehension has been interpreted as the reflection of a fundamental opposition between science and faith. The clarifications furnished by recent historical studies enable us to state that this sad misunderstanding now belongs to the past."

Misunderstandings associated with the story of Galileo were particularly evident, however, in the way the American press described the

October event in the Vatican. The headline on the front page of *The New York Times* (31 October 1992) was representative: "After 350 Years, Vatican Says Galileo Was Right: It Moves." The lead for the story in the *Chicago Sun Times* was: "Pope Says Galileo Was Right: Earth Moves Around the Sun." Other newspapers, radio, and television repeated the same claim. One might forgive journalists the sensational distortion of headlines, but the

attendant stories only reinforced the image evoked at the beginning.

The story in *The New York Times* offers an excellent example of the persistence and power of the myth of the Galileo affair. In the guise of a straight forward news account, the author, Allan Cowell noted that the Pope's address would "rectify one of the Church's most infamous wrongs — the persecution of the Italian astronomer and physicist for proving the Earth moves about the Sun." But Galileo did not prove that the Earth moves about the sun. In fact, Galileo and the theologians of the Inquisition accepted the prevailing Aristotelian ideal of scientific demonstration which required that science be sure and certain knowledge in terms of necessary causes, not the conclusions of hypothetical or probabilistic reasoning which today we tend to accept as science.

For Galileo, as for Aristotle, science is not first of all an activity, not a program of experimental investigation. Rather, it is that knowledge which is the result of inquiry, expressed with the rigor of syllogistic demonstration. In order to understand Galileo's encounter with the Inquisition, we need to guard against the anachronistic application of contemporary notions of science to events more that three centuries ago.

Galileo did not think that his astronomical observations provided sufficient evidence to prove that the Earth moves, although he did think that they called into question the truth of Ptolemaic

**We need to
guard against the
anachronistic
application of
contemporary notions
of science to events
more that three
centuries ago.**

astronomy. His discoveries of mountains on the moon and spots on the surface of the sun challenged the view that the heavens were incorruptible and perfect, that Venus exhibited phases like the moon and showed that the planet revolved about the sun. Galileo, writing in *The Starry Messenger* (1610), claimed that his most important discovery was the existence of the four moons of Jupiter, since it removed a major objection to Copernican

astronomy, viz., that for Copernicus there were two centers of heavenly motion: the Earth, about which the moon revolved, and the sun, about which the Earth and the other planets revolved. Opponents of Copernicus thought such a claim absurd. How could the universe be the orderly, harmonious creation it is and have more than one center of motion? As a result of Galileo's observations no one could doubt that there were at least two centers of motion in the heavens: the Earth and Jupiter.

Galileo did hope eventually to argue from the fact of ocean tides, to the double motion of the Earth as their only possible cause. He knew that a truly demonstrative claim in physics had to take such a form, but he was never successful in demonstrating the motion of the Earth. He was working on this argument based on the tides early in the seventeenth century — he circulated a manuscript privately in Rome in 1615; and the argument appeared in the fourth section of his *Dialogue Concerning the Two Chief World Systems*, published in 1632. It was the publication of this work which was the immediate occasion for Galileo's appearance before the Inquisition in 1633. The book, written in the form of a dialogue, compares geocentric and heliocentric astronomies, leaving little doubt as to which ought to be embraced. Convincing as the refutation of Aristotelian and Ptolemaic astronomy might be, the text did not contain a scientific demonstration

for the motion of the Earth. The argument from effect to cause, from the ocean tides to the rotation and revolution of the Earth, appeared in the rhetorical form of demonstrative language (Galileo used rhetoric well), but it seems likely that Galileo, himself, was aware that the argument lacked true probative force.

Cardinal Robert Bellarmine, Jesuit theologian and the most prominent official of the Inquisition, told Galileo as early as 1615 that if there were a true demonstration for the motion of the Earth then theologians would have to abandon the traditional reading of those passages in the Bible which appeared to be contrary. But, in the absence of such a demonstration, and in the midst of the controversies of the Protestant Reformation, the Cardinal urged prudence: treat Copernican astronomy simply as a hypothetical model which accounts for the observed phenomena.

If Cardinal Bellarmine had thought that the immobility of the Earth were a matter of faith, he could not admit, as he did, the possibility of a demonstration to the contrary. The theologians of the Inquisition and Galileo adhered to the ancient Catholic principle that, since God is the author of all truth, the truths of science and the truths of revelation cannot contradict one another. In 1616, when the Inquisition ordered Galileo not to hold or to defend Copernican astronomy there was no demonstration for the motion of the Earth. It seemed obvious to the theologians in Rome that the Earth did not move and that the Bible confirmed this fact. The Inquisition did not think that it was requiring Galileo to choose between faith and science. Nor, in the absence of scientific knowledge for the motion of the Earth, would Galileo have thought that he was asked to make such a choice. The disciplinary decree of the Inquisition was unwise and imprudent: but it was the result of the subordination of the interpretation of certain passages of the Bible to a

geocentric cosmology, a cosmology which would eventually be rejected.

In the presentation of the findings of the recent papal commission to Pope John Paul II, Cardinal Paul Poupard, head of one of the commission's four working groups, noted that the erroneous conclusions of the Inquisition's theological experts were the result of "a transitional situation in the field of astronomical knowledge and of an exegetical confusion regarding cosmology." The theologians "failed to grasp the profound, non-literal meaning of the Scriptures when they describe the physical structure of the created universe." Galileo's judges, "incapable of dissociating faith from an age-old cosmology, believed quite wrongly that the adoption of the Copernican revolution, in fact not yet definitively proven, was such as to undermine Catholic tradition, and that it was their duty to forbid its being taught."

Within the history of Catholic thought the conclusion of the theologians of the Inquisition was somewhat of an aberration. As early as the fourth century, St. Augustine had warned against using scientific theories to provide definitive interpretations of biblical texts:

In matters that are obscure and far beyond our vision, even in such as we may find treated in Holy Scripture, different interpretations are sometimes possible without prejudice to the faith we have received. In such a case, we should not rush in headlong and so firmly take our stand on one side that, if further progress in the search of truth

justly undermines this position, we too fall with it. That would not be to battle for the teaching of Holy Scripture for our own, wishing its teaching to conform to ours, whereas we ought to wish ours to conform to that of Sacred Scripture. [De Genesi ad litteram, I. 36]

Galileo often quoted Augustine when he argued that the Bible ought not to be used to determine the truth or falsity of

**Within the history
of Catholic thought
the conclusion of the
theologians of
the Inquisition was
somewhat of an
aberration.**

scientific propositions which are not central to religious belief. Galileo liked to repeat the remark attributed to Cardinal Baronius: the Bible teaches us how to go to heaven, not how the heavens go.

According to the account in *The New York Times*, Galileo defended himself before the Inquisition in 1633 "by saying that scientific research and the Christian faith were not mutually exclusive and that the study of the natural world would promote understanding and interpretation of the scriptures. But his views were judged 'false and erroneous.'" In fact, the Inquisition accepted the view that science and faith were complementary. In 1633 Galileo was accused of disobeying the 1616 injunction not to defend Copernican astronomy. The Inquisition's injunction, however ill-advised, only makes sense if we recognize that the Inquisition saw no possibility of a conflict between science and religion, both properly understood. Condemned as "vehemently suspect of heresy," Galileo was required to recant, and he was placed under a kind of house arrest at his villa outside Florence until his death in 1642. From beginning to end, the actions of the Inquisition were disciplinary, not dogmatic, although they were based on the erroneous notion that it was heretical to claim that the Earth moves. ☩

Right or Wrong

Charles E. Rice

Notre Dame Law School

IN HIS STATE OF THE STATE message on January 14th, Governor William Donald Schaefer proposed that Maryland offer free Norplant inserts to women on welfare and free vasectomies to men leaving prison; he suggested that such birth control measures be made mandatory in some cases.

Norplant consists of sex matchstick-size capsules implanted under the skin of a woman's upper arm. It releases a hormone which operates to prevent fertilization or, if fertilization does occur, to prevent implantation of the embryo in the womb. Therefore, although commonly described as a contraceptive, Norplant is also an abortifacient.

The implant is effective for five years and cannot be removed by the woman herself but only by a physician. Norplant is covered by Medicaid in all 50 states and more than 500,000 women have received the implant since its introduction in 1991.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE:

"We Catholic scholars in various disciplines join in fellowship in order to serve Jesus Christ better by helping one another in our work by putting our abilities more fully at the service of the Catholic faith."

Photocopy form to request information on Fellowship of Catholic Scholarship Membership

Name _____ Address _____
 Institution _____ City/State/Zip _____

Send request to Dr. Joseph P. Scottino, Executive Secretary and Treasurer, Fellowship of Catholic Scholars, Gannon University, Erie, Pennsylvania, 16541.

"It's a great time to be alive, provided you're in a great Fellowship" (Msgr. William B. Smith)

Measures to compel women on welfare to receive Norplant have been introduced in 13 state legislatures. For example, former presidential candidate David Duke proposed, in the Louisiana state legislature, that poor mothers be paid \$100 per year to use Norplant.

Free Norplant inserts are offered to students at Paquin School, a Baltimore public high school for teenage mothers, without parental knowledge or consent, which program drew praise from the *New York Times* and is likely to serve as a model for other schools.

Norplant is the utilitarian weapon of choice against the welfare problem, especially among minority groups. The coercion is implicit but real. As Arthur Caplan, director of the Center for Biomedical Ethics at the University of Minnesota said, "Today, a welfare mother is coerced into using Norplant. Tomorrow, the state is in the parent licensing business."

This advent of legalized genocide should prompt us to recall that this is the 25th anniversary of *Humanae Vitae*, the 1968 encyclical of Pope Paul VI. *Humanae Vitae* affirmed what had been the unbroken teaching of all Christian religions until the Anglican Lambeth Conference of 1930 that contraception is always an objective moral wrong. The encyclical was greeted with scorn by clerics and laity of the *Church of Where It's At*. But nobody in his right mind is laughing at Paul VI now.

Humanae Vitae prophetically forecast that, if contraception were regarded as legitimate in any case, the state would eventually impose it by coercion. "A dangerous weapon would thus be placed in the hands of those public authorities who take no heed of moral exigencies. Who could blame a government for applying to the solution of the problems of the community those means acknowledge to be licit for married couples in the solution of a family problem? Who will stop rulers from favoring, from even imposing upon their peoples, if they were to consider it necessary, the method of contraception which they judge to be the most efficacious? In such a way men would reach the point of placing at the mercy of the intervention

of public authorities the most personal and most reserved sector of conjugal intimacy."

In his 1991 social encyclical, *Centesimus Annus*, Pope John Paul II denounced the "systematic anti-childbearing campaigns which, on the basis of a distorted view of the demographic problem and in a climate of 'absolute lack of respect for the freedom of choice of the parties involved,' often subject them 'to intolerable pressures... to force them to submit to this new form of oppression. These policies are extending their field of action by the use of new techniques, to the point of poisoning the lives of millions of defenseless human beings, as if in a form of 'chemical warfare.'"

On this 25th anniversary of *Humanae Vitae*, the prophetic character of the encyclical is clear.

The 'birth control mentality' in the words of Irish Cardinal Cahal Daly, "Means the abandonment of self-control over sexual urges; it implicitly authorizes sexual promiscuity. ... Society makes it unnaturally difficult for people, particularly young people, to be continent; and then offers a remedy, contraceptives, which merely increases the incontinence. Promiscuity is the logic of birth control; but to have promiscuity with impunity there must also be abortion and infanticide, sterilization and euthanasia. The logical contraceptionists must insist that if these cannot be generalized by persuasion, they must be imposed by law. It has long been recognized that there is a connection between eroticism and totalitarianism."

My impression is that many Notre Dame students know *Humanae Vitae* only through professional and clerical caricatures of it. Its 25th anniversary is not likely to be officially celebrated here. But perhaps we could commemorate the encyclical by taking an anniversary poll, providing the members of the Notre Dame Theology Department an opportunity to state publicly and individually whether they accept and support *Humanae Vitae* and its prophetic character.

[This is a reprint of Dr. Rice's weekly column in *The Observer*, the campus daily of the University of Notre Dame.]

Unifying the Divided Magisterium

Msgr. George A. Kelly

THE STRANGEST QUESTION I've been asked, following my fiftieth anniversary as a priest, has been: "Would you do it all over again?" Not once, but asked a half dozen times in nine different ways by old parishioner friends of mine, the question always came out the same. Would it be worthwhile, they were inquiring, to begin one's adult life in 1992 all over again as a priest? The first time I heard it I didn't take it too seriously, because the couple asking it knew quite well how much I enjoyed being a priest when they were teenagers. And they had solid reason to know I was still having fun at what by now was a very old stand. They could only guess, however, that having been anointed in an era when a cleric didn't ask what the Church was going to do for him, the average priest my age expected to take whatever hard knocks that came his way. We discovered early that, if we did our work, the human compensations of the priesthood were quite good. Especially, the life-long parishioner friends from many places, like the ones close enough to ask an intimate question such as, "Would you do it all over again?"

Most parishioners, involved in their parish affairs, sensed the plus-value of the priesthood then. If the working Church system pleased most Catholics most of the time, it was surely satisfying for the priest. Bishops, and pastors generally, were sure of themselves, knew how to implement Church directives and how to deal with things that harmed the Church. They argued loudly among themselves about incidentals, but were one in faith and one with Rome. Bishops were regularly good to their priests, but could chew up a miscreant in a half hour, and end up saying to him, "Nothing personal in this, you know." And,

most of the time, priests and people were on their own, disciplined enough to do what was expected of them as members of the Church, knowing, too, that they could call on the bishop to protect the Church's best interests when things got out of hand.

The persistent questioning of my psyche by old friends eventually led me to suspect that my inquisitors' curiosity might have had more to do with what they were feeling about their own Catholic lives, than with my state of mind. We had travelled the Church together by different paths, they to become the Church's post-World War II parents and post-Vatican II grandparents, three, five, seven children in one generation, and to extended families of ten to twenty in the next. They were practicing Catholics to the man and woman, sometimes active still in their parishes, but belonging to none of the activist movements that proliferated everywhere after 1965. They regularly read their diocesan newspapers, but would not know the ideological difference between *The National Catholic Reporter* and *The Wanderer*, perhaps not even of their existence. But, would they do it over again, if they faced the ecclesial situation in which their children matured?

"Who Speaks For the People?"

Harry Truman once asked a Cleveland priest: "Hey, Father, who speaks for the people?" He posed the question (1948) when many thought the President talked for hardly anyone, save perhaps his Senate cronies or the "Missouri Gang." It's a good question to ask today about the Catholic people.

After 1965 a great many spokesmen claimed to speak for the Church's rank and file:

Among them were a group of traditionalists who wanted a Latin Mass in the mode of Pius V above all else.

Also, innovators who looked upon the Mass as a community offering to the detriment of its sacrificial and priestly aspects.

Priests who wanted wives.

Nuns, and ex-nuns, who resented patriarchy, especially that represented by pastors, including bishops.

Canon lawyers, mostly men, mostly Americans, who used the Church's New Code to make second marriages easy for divorced Catholics previously "married" by a priest, in spite of admonitions to the contrary from John Paul II.

Catholic women who wanted to be priests, or at least be free to choose death, as well as life, for their unborn babies. Homosexual activists who rejected the Judeo-Christian norm for proper sexual behavior.

Theologians who wanted a pope to be chairman of a theological board, rather than the final judge of authentic Catholic teaching.

Religious superiors who opted for a different poverty, chastity and obedience than the specific meaning of those vows as intended by the Church.

Catholic college presidents who readily observed rules imposed by government but resented, nullified, or rejected norms enacted by the Church in the interest of the integrity of institutions claiming to be Catholic.

University professors who prized professional approval, above all other values, even if doing what they were doing was inconsistent with their Catholic commitment, and with the religious submission they owed to the Church's magisterium even if, in the process, they alienated the young from the Church.

These above specialists have had much to say about the popular Catholic mind in the last quarter century. But are their views consistent with the faith and moral norms of the Church? Are they the authentic voices of 50,000,000 baptized Catholics? Or, of the 15,000,000 to be found more or less in the pews on Sunday mornings? Or, of the 15,000,000 who no longer attend

Mass at all?

A large proportion of our Church-going parishioners did not clamor for many of those changes in faith or discipline which specialists wanted for their Church. Granted such ordinary Catholics were only reasonably educated, perhaps twelve to sixteen years by priests and nuns; only parents, too, of more than a few children, but disturbed by what has happened to the Catholicity of their families. While priests were enjoying the comfort, and the freedom, of the priesthood, they were living in flats or in someone else's house. They may not have asked for all their kids, but there is none they would ever give back, not even the handicapped or the unruly. Rarely did they enjoy a summer vacation, except by the day; owning a car was their pipe-dream, but they managed to squeeze out an extra ten dollars a month for their teenagers' Catholic high school education. Yet they always showed up at Church on Sunday morning looking as if they had just inherited money.

The burdens of family life in that period were not light. Mother, the homemaker, seemingly carried the heavier burden, but father, the breadwinner, is rarely given enough credit for scraping for money week by week or playing household cop, if only part-time. Husbands weren't always easy to live with but then neither were overworked wives who could inflict cruelty

on spouses as readily as the much-maligned heads of the house. These Catholics didn't talk out loud about their sex life; but if you watch them now, in the autumn of their lives, they must have done some things that ended up right. This point comes across powerfully when, in spite of the imperfections in all marital relationships, a priest stands in a funeral parlor and watches honest sorrow at the loss of one who was their very own.

What do you think kept

**A large proportion
of our Church-going
parishioners did not
clamor for many
of those changes
in faith or discipline
which specialists
wanted for
their Church.**

these people on dead center of doing their duty year after year? Perhaps the lack of money or having nowhere else to go had something to do with it. Perhaps the mores of a Protestant nation inhibited any libertarianism in their bones, compelling them to hang together rather than separately. But, those who really know these parishioners will still find them saying that they did what they did because it was the right and proper thing to do. And because the Church said so. The Church was the rock on which they based their way of life. Only a bold but careless Americanizing sociologist would dare to tell them to their faces that they did what they did simply because they were immigrant sheep or innocent lambs of a less than modernized Church. No, they were raised well in a faith that was deepened in the struggle out of poverty, and during an extended war sanctified by their worship and the good example of their priests and nuns. They are the middle-class today, attached even now to their extended families, but pleased not at all with the impieties and religious indifference of their offspring for whom they denied themselves so much. As a sixty-year-old mother of six mused dolefully: "It's not so much that they're bad thirty-year-old kids, or even that they don't go to Mass unless on a special occasion. They just don't care about the Church. Not the way we did." These parents think the Church has let them down.

The accepted explanation, in elite circles, of the ecclesial disaffections of the "me too generation", the one favored by many of the Church's literati, is that the secularized culture finally invaded the Catholic sanctuary via television and rock and roll, leaving Church authorities helpless. The only culpability these Catholic headline makers might assign to hierarchy would be its failure, after Vatican II, to go further in dismantling "the fortress Church". Many parents do not accept this

The only culpability these Catholic headline makers might assign to hierarchy would be its failure, after Vatican II, to go further in dismantling "the fortress Church."

rationale, arguing that, if bishops could protect their grandparents from Protestants in the 19th century, why could they not protect their children from Secularists in the 20th?

While most of these suffering souls rarely brought their complaints to the bishop, one of their numbers, once in a while, broke into print as a voice crying out of simple people's wilderness. One such was A.N. Gareau of Columbus, Georgia, protesting to CRISIS (November 1992) that the

Church's contemporary problem does not consist merely of "adulterers, divorcees, and people practicing birth control receiving Communion every Sunday," but of people his age (nearing 70) no longer in the pews at all.

He stated his case on behalf of the Church's suffering servants as follows:

Throughout my years I have remained faithful to my wife and family and, where we could manage it, our children attended Catholic schools. I served as usher, lector, on parish school boards and in numerous other positions, until I could no longer take the heresy that was spouted by our clergy. One nun, the principal of a Catholic elementary school: 'Teaching is not enough for me, I think I will go into politics.' Within the next few months she married the priest-principal of our deanery high school and left the area. We had, and still have, at least one well-known priest writing what amounts to pornographic novels, but being allowed to keep his collar.

We have had and continue to have bishops openly defying Rome, and nothing is done to them. Another priest recommending *Playboy* as reading matter: 'Each issue has several good writers,' He, too, left the Church to be married (to the nun mentioned above). Another nun: 'My order will never get me back in a habit again.' Another priest: 'I will give communion to

whomever comes to the altar, even if I know he is of a Protestant faith'.

My wife and I still support the Church and many of its activities with money and our prayers. We support the pope. We have always thought that there must have been a whole lot of dissatisfied priests and nuns in the Church in the 1960s, and believe the Church is better off without them.

Notice that the CRISIS correspondent does not stress scandalous sexual behavior as the source of recent Catholic leakage, perhaps because Catholics have always taken behavioral problems of the clergy in stride. Perhaps, too, because ordinary Church-goers were shocked more by what went on among many women religious in the breakup of their beloved school system.

A. N. Gareau pointed an accusing finger, instead, to "the divided *magisterium*."

The Divided Magisterium

Magisterium is divided whenever two contradictory teaching positions on matters of faith and morals are proposed by and/or remain operative in Church bodies and appear to the faithful as legitimate Catholic choices because over a long time they are tolerated by hierarchy whose *magisterium* is defined by the Church as controlling.

Unquestionably and absolutely the Church is bleeding people-wise because there is really a "divided *magisterium*" in the Church — the pope against some of his own professors in Rome, even against some members of his Curia, against important National Conferences of Catholic Bishops, within such Conferences themselves — bishops against bishops, bishops against their own bureaucrats, the major theological associations against the pope and those bishops in union with him, pastors against bishops who dare institutionalize universal Catholic norms in their dioceses. All the fine points of these assertions have been amply documented or evaluated a hundred times over by competent observers in book after book. Paul VI

and John Paul II have spoken and written often on the abuses that followed Vatican II. A conscious effort to minimize the seriousness of the Church's present condition goes on regularly in some Catholic quarters, even though the state of affairs is more characteristic of Protestantism, whose *magisterium* is personal conscience. Once upon a time in the United States, contradictory dissenters had sufficient discipline to theorize about faith and morals in carefully calculated circles, conscious of their obligations to Catholic people, as well as to *magisterium*. As late as 1962 the outgoing president of the Catholic Theological Society of America, Aloysius McDonough, C.P., declared that however valuable the professional theologian was, "in relation to the hierarchy the position of the theologian is auxiliary, subsidiary." At that time, too, an obstreperous or unbelieving or disrespectful dissenter might leave the Church or face canonical penalties. Today, however, respect for hierarchy, even the Pope, is in short supply among many academics and Church authority appears to many, at the grassroots level of the Church, to provide legitimate space within the ecclesial family for doctrinal dissemblers. The clear line between true and false, right and wrong, has also been blurred, so much so that Catholic faith and the objective Word of God on which it rests, i.e., Catholic reality itself, is buried in the seemingly endless controversies over words and symbols. Such a divided house cannot long have meaningful existence for adherents, as mainline Protestant Churches discovered earlier in this century.

One recalls here St. Francis Xavier who, after a missionary trek, thought his time had come to tour Europe's most famous universities, him crying out to their leading lights "like a mad man": "What a tragedy," he said, "How many souls are being shut out of heaven and falling into hell, thanks to you! I wish they would work as hard at this as they do at their books, and so settle their account with God for their learning and the talents entrusted to them."

The core of our contemporary difficulty has to be the co-existence of "the second

magisterium”, which higher authority says has no legitimacy, but which continues to function because *magisterium* itself is divided into factions over its presence and function. Even when the hierarchy is of one mind on policy, it no longer knows how to deal with this major guerrilla force within, offering Catholics a second way of being a good Catholic without taking seriously many things Rome says, even about the faith. The second *magisterium* exercises real pastoral power in three places — in religious communities, among college and university presidents with their professors, and in the theological establishment. These sub-officials of the Church have successfully institutionalized a type of dissent among their constituents which in practice leads to “pick and choose Catholicism.” Within *magisterium* itself, bishops can be found today who favor their cause.

The problem of contradictory doctrinal pluralism goes very deep, because a “*laissez-faire*” type of government has become, at least for the moment, a *de facto* policy of the universal Church. Even some local bishops go their own way, in spite of the clear mind of the universal *magisterium*. Remi De Roo, Bishop of Victoria, B.C., Canada, has expressed publicly his unwillingness to submit his dissenting views “to whatever authority”, including that of Rome. In published conversations with a woman religious and a journalist, a book called *In the Eye of the Storm*, there is *prima facie* evidence of this divided *magisterium* at high levels. If one follows his three-fold conversations, one so disposed would be led to conclude that the Vatican was wrong in disciplining Hans Kung, Charles Curran, Leonardo Boff, and Archbishop Hunthausen; women should be ordained priests (refusal to allow this is “destroying the soul of the *magisterium*”); there is nothing wrong with contraception; the pope hasn’t praised the positive fruits of technology; there should not be mandatory clerical celibacy (it stands in the way of a “more

positive reflection of the values of sexuality”); homosexual activity is all right; those who are divorced and remarried should be allowed to go to communion.

Several years ago, in a differently styled conversation, a few Roman Cardinals were discussing “schism” with a number of priests. One said: “Not in the United States, because there are too many faithful Catholics and bishops there. But, in Brazil maybe, because a third of those bishops, well over 100, are at serious odds with the Pope.” One well-known episcopal dissenter in the United States, confronted by one of his young priests, who promised to turn him in to Rome, responded, “I have an army of people all around reporting me to Rome, but I’m still here, am I not?” In still another diocese, where a notorious dissenting seminary continues to exist, the Ordinary at a priests’ meeting, sloughed off questions about changes in Catholic teaching with the remark: “Nothing like that is going to happen as long as John Paul II is alive.” As if issues like celibacy, contraception, women’s ordination, homosexual behavior, are relative matters, subject to corrective action by a future pope. Parishioners recount tales of this or that newly-ordained priest explaining in the pulpit how he doesn’t agree with the pope on everything, or of a young pastor’s Sunday message in the parish bulletin counselling contraceptive users or homosexual sodomists that they are free to receive Holy Communion worthily, or of an older pastor who invites two pro-abortion candidates to speak in his parish hall prior to election, or of the disrespect shown often by women religious against the manhood of the priesthood, especially of the pope, or of the bureaucracies, from the United States Catholic Conference downward, whose original drafts of pastorals or catechisms or guidelines or sacramentaries or lectionaries are, more often than not, defective in their presentation of Catholic teaching or discipline.

People in the pews, who

**Within
magisterium itself,
bishops can be found
today who favor
their cause.**

pay the parish bills, can hardly be pleased with the credibility of a Church made to appear uncertain about its own convictions. On the other hand, people not in the pews are hardly enticed to be reconciled validly to sacramental life, as long as the grapevine suggests little is wrong with claiming "good Catholic" status while half-believing or half-practicing the Church's faith.

Unifying the Magisterium

“Unifying the magisterium” simply means restoring the “*sensus fidei*” of Catholics on matters of faith and morals reinforced by clear and firm episcopal teaching, repeated over and over again and everywhere, or by episcopal correction of error as necessary, at low levels of authority as well as high, and by bishops circumscribing the right of anyone, especially a priest or a religious, to use a Church office or a Catholic institution or Church auspices to lead people into error against the Church, or into sin.

Harry Truman's alleged remark to his wife Bess at Dwight Eisenhower's inauguration, “Wait till he pushes the button in the Oval Office and finds that no one answers”, applies more to Catholic Chanceries today than it did to the administrations of those two American presidents. Major documents from Rome on the nature of Christ and the Church, on Catholic worship and the priesthood, on the nature of religious life, on Catholic theology and on Catholic morality, on Catholic higher education, have never been as numerous. Yet these authoritative declarations of the *magisterium* are diluted of their meaning, if not ignored, in the very centers of education and social service which form the Church's life line.

The Catholic Church, in important respects, has become a lawless society. Unquestionably it has always been somewhat lawless, if the number of sinners are measured against the num-

**Jesuit Cardinal
Jean Danielou
once insisted correctly:
“It is the non-use
of authority that is
creating our
problems.”**

ber of saints. But the virtue of the suffering Church has always been that its sinners did not pretend to be saints, nor offer themselves as models of a new sanctity aborning against Church norms. Even though standard Catholic understanding defines a good Catholic as one who generally obeys the laws of Christ as codified by His Church, leaders of “pick and choose Catholicism” have substituted,

successfully, it seems, a contradictory pluralism of beliefs and moral standards for the customary “one Lord, one faith, one baptism.”

What is law but a judgment of reason by competent authority prescribing or proscribing specific behavior on behalf of society's constitution and the common good of those who freely belong to that society? Citizens of every society, presumptively in the Church's case believers, with good reason will accept the judgment of established law and, even if some are unhappy with a part of it, do not sabotage its effective implementation in the life of their community. Civility also presumes that law-breakers will be forced by competent authority to obey, or at least not do violence to public order by disobeying obstreperously or continuously. As St. Thomas so wisely remarked, only law-breakers, not the law-abiding, have need of law enforcement.

Public disorder today in Church and State is the result of the subversion of public authority. Jesuit Cardinal Jean Danielou once insisted correctly: “It is the non-use of authority that is creating our problems.” The Catholic Church once praised so highly in modern times for its ability to restrain with modest force its worst internal enemies, has also acquiesced to the alleged egalitarian ruling style of secular society or succumbed to the “therapeutic gospel” of the times which claims that violaters of public law are misled, disadvantaged or sick, to be counselled or given therapy, not punished because no one is fully or truly responsible for offenses against the commonweal.

In recent years a harvest of books have delineated the source of our social chaos, the most notable of which bear an interesting collection of names: *A Nation of Victims*, *Culture of Narcissism*, *Disunity of America*, *End of Equality*, *Rise of Selfishness in America*. Yet authority figures continue to wonder how to handle the malaise, the disease, or the violence that often ensues from law-breaking even after extended dialogue with the would-be or actual law-breakers. In the meantime, public offenders continue to escape justice, and society increasingly becomes an unsafe place to live.

Surprisingly, a similar rash of religious offenses have overtaken the streets of the Church. More and more meetings are called to mediate controversies that seem eternal, more official documents delineate right from wrong, more and more calls have gone out from Rome for correction and obedience and more and more disorder continues to appear at high and low levels of the Church. Indeed, the termination of Charles Curran's career at the Catholic University, the withdrawal of a few imprimaturs, and a handful of monita, represent the sum total of disciplinary efforts by *magisterium* to insure the proper teaching of the Church and the worthy administration of the sacraments. And these efforts, sensitive or timid as they may be, have not worked. A close look at what has gone on in Catholic convents, schools, bureaucracies, over the past quarter century demonstrates that dissenters know how to police their areas of control, once in office. Dissenters who decry sanctions are very good at sanctioning their critics by labelling them as pre-Vatican II reactionaries or withholding positions or promotions as the case may be.

The growing anger among certain specialized Catholics, among dissenting theologians, among invalidly married priests and would-be women priests, among pro-abortionists and militant homosexuals, has been fed by expectations, born of tolerance, that their postures are now expressions of legitimate Catholic pluralism, that their views may co-exist legitimately with *magisterium* as choices, even if not recognized as

the Church's best choices. And their anti-ecclesial choices may not be penalized by competent Church authority. The fire of their anger is further fanned when they sense growing favor on the streets, but continued frowns from Rome. Did not one see the outrage in *The Leadership Conference of Catholic Women* when the Holy See created *The Council of Major Superiors of Women*, and official recognition, if there ever was one, that those who reject the "essential elements" of religious life are no longer to be seen as the wave of the Catholic future? Such outrage can be perceived as the other side of arrogance, born of extended tolerance of disobedience.

Catering to special Church interests is self-defeating, even to the unorganized Sunday Church-goers who have suffered more or less silently for twenty-five years. Yet, faith in received teaching and habits of piety — that for which regular Church-goers stand — should be the framework of any sound Catholic order, and of whatever discipline is required for Church leadership to set the proper example.

This has been hierarchy's role from the beginning: "The Lord knows how to rescue devout men from trial, and how to continue the punishment of the wicked up to the Day of Judgment. He knows, especially how to treat those who live for the flesh in their desire for whatever corrupts, and who despise authority." (2 Peter 2,9).

Renewing Aggiornamento — Facing the Problem

Without a doubt the long awaited updating of the Church, designed by John XXIII for the Second Vatican Council, has only partially been realized. The successes, e.g., an understandable liturgy, a new and developed sense of the content of biblical books, more sensitivity in relations with other Christians, Jews, even unbelievers, and the related world-wide institutionalization of the Church's social apostolate, have been more than offset by the tragedies of faith and morals within the largest

body of Catholic worshippers in the family of democratic nations, not excluding clergy and religious. Most particularly, we have lost the better part of a generation of young Catholic America, who never came to love their Church as their parents did. And as long as important Catholic sub-structures are administered at cross-purposes with what Vatican II said was their apostolate, the possibility of recovery in that quarter, let alone total revitalization, is somewhat dismal.

Most Church-goers, who esteem their Catholic birthright, are aware that they are the Catholics sustaining the Church; but they also know that, when they go to God, they leave behind them a missionary Church one not unlike what their grandfathers encountered a century ago. Still, they hope that by now those in authority recognize the severity of the present Catholic crisis, the one that they see in the lives of their children, in their parishes, schools and press. Likely, most of them have little idea that during the 1970's Rome became more afraid of schism than of prolonged toleration of dissent and disobedience. These Catholics, on the other hand, not Rome, had the first-hand contact with the doctrinal shoot-outs that occurred from 1965 onward at the "I'm OK, You're OK, Corral". They watched the Church's Ike Clantons use firepower to gain their control of "the Catholic yards", while the Church's Wyatt Earps merely repeated "*magisterium*". And they saw that word "*magisterium*" fall quickly on deaf ears in "the yards", with bishops standing outside looking in on, but not after, "the corral".

The suffering servants themselves had no experience with schism, nor knowledge that it sometimes came on fast, more often (and more dangerously), however, slowly over time, somewhat like a cancer. But they did watch divided rectories, divided convents, divided colleges, and

**One must see to it
that we hold fast to
that which was
believed everywhere,
always, and by all ;
for that is Catholic
in the true and
proper sense.**

wondered whether Catholic parishes and schools, and religious life itself, would not be better today had a few Wyatt Earps been around to defend their vested interest in the existence of these bodies as fully Catholic.

Few today really doubt that existing, but alienated, institutions, still claiming the name Catholic, have depressed the piety of the Catholic masses, in spite of the gospel line they heard so often, "It is better for you to enter

into life with one eye, than with two eyes to be thrown into fiery Gehenna:" (Mt. 18, 9)

Sunday-to-Sunday worshippers, developing their families at the time, also came to recognize that they were witnessing not just bad behavior, but the teaching of wrong belief. Parishioners who customarily took sinners in stride, even among the clergy, quivered when they heard this or that priest or nun waffle about or deny what they knew the Church held dearly. Most would not have known the word "orthodoxy". In their lexicon Catholicity meant "right belief". They would not have had the least idea that Vincent of Lerins stated a principle in the fifth century which they believed to be true in the twentieth: "One must see to it that we hold fast to that which was believed *everywhere, always, and by all*; for that is Catholic in the true and proper sense." Pious Catholics in 1962 thought the Church of Vatican II still held this to be true. Yet, by the time of the First Roman Synod in 1967 this rubric was being rejected in wide areas of their local Church. Everything was often less than the best at the parish level, and they themselves were sometimes hypocritical in their pretensions. But their "*sensus fidei*" saw Catholic doctrine to be clear in its meaning and precise in its expression. The Real Presence meant Eucharistic Real Presence, not just their wish that it be so. It was this very realism which distinguished the Catholic Church from most other Christian bodies, and specified an im-

portant reason for its uniqueness.

The Church-going faithful also accepted as a basic principle of Catholic life that only hierarchy, in union with the pope, can protect their faith and the way of life they understood to be Christian. Priests can't do that, laity can't do it, scholars can't do it, dialogue won't do it, not even saints will do it. Prayer will do it — but only if the hierarchy does the work which belongs to it alone. The government of the Church is a unique gift from God. Even the best, the brightest, and the most saintly, are called upon as children of God to unify with this system. Church-goers, and those who don't go at all, are free to think, but they do not decide what truly Christian teaching or practice is, nor decide what best suffuses the life of Catholic institutions with the Church's faith. The bishops alone, therefore, are obligated to see that the laity's faith is regularly reinforced, certainly to protect them from the bad behavior of those to whose spiritual safekeeping they are entrusted.

Renewing Aggiornamento — Solving the Problem

Special Note: The fundamental presumption underlying the recommendations that follow is that *magisterium* means what it says when it pronounces formally on matters of doctrine, morals, and Church policy. This presumption is not shared by important segments of the Catholic community, from Hans Kung to Rosemary Reuther through important Jesuit office holders, in Rome and elsewhere. Denial that Rome and Bishops' Conferences mean what they say is encapsulated in their oft-repeated observation: "Watch what they do, not what they say." The implication of their argument is that prelates in high places are intellectually committed to pruning the Church of those ancient doctrines and structures which are

The Church-going faithful also accepted as a basic principle of Catholic life that only hierarchy, in union with the pope, can protect their faith and the way of life they understood to be Christian.

considered obstacles to the modernization of the Church that was really intended by the Council. Yet they dare not, for the moment, turn away from the traditional Catholic rhetoric. Consequently, the argument continues, old words are still used, but their old meanings are allowed to fall into desuetude by the unflinching toleration of contrary preaching and contrary practice. In the distant future the old formulas will be replaced to reflect better the new orthopraxis

of the Church community.

As evidence of what they would call an inexorable trend, the reformers point to the wipe-out of Latin in the Liturgy, the widespread teaching of the morality of contraception, the withering away of the sacrament of penance, the tolerated autonomy of religious superiors, college presidents, and the theological establishment from any significant magisterial supervision, the widespread liturgical abuses, simulation of the sacramentals, easy annulments, priestless parishes, mistranslations of sacred texts — all of these going on year after year, in spite of one magisterial document after another saying the opposite.

Increasingly, today, those who have defended the proposition that *magisterium* means what it says when it says it, observing the victory claims of the reformers and the continuing toleration of abuses, have now begun publicly to manifest suspicion that they have been wrong all along, that the Church is moving in a direction other than the one it officially professes.

This writer rejects these postulates, preferring to believe that the highest officers misread the intentions of the post-Vatican II reformers and, in a sense, mismanaged the implementation of Council decrees by erratic responses to attacks on *magisterium* and by granting unnecessary leeway to lower officials even bishops, to defy settled Church policy. Because the programs proposed by dissent-

ers have debilitated Church structures and piety does not mean that they are functioning with the blessing of *magisterium*. To assert such collusion as a fact is to accuse *magisterium* of hypocrisy, a charge Christ leveled against the Pharisees, when He advised His disciples to follow what these false leaders said, not what they did. This writer believes that the suffering of the Church in the recent quarter century is part of Christ's on-going Passion, awaiting a new dawn for the Church in the modern world during the pontificate of John Paul II or soon thereafter, providing that *magisterium*, that which distinguishes the Catholic Church does what Christ expects of it, when Christ gave to its officers the Keys of His Kingdom.

Within this context alone are the following recommendations made:

Unquestionably, the Second Vatican Council made what some call impossible demands on bishops, by establishing multiple priorities that go in more directions than one, but without changing any episcopal rights or duties. The episcopacy of a particular Church, already in poor condition (e.g., South America), could by following the Council's lead only look better. On the other hand, the fall from grace of a Church like Holland's, and so fast (by 1968), can be attributed in large part to the failures of the seven bishops, whose 6,000,000 Catholics were overrun willy-nilly by dissenting activists holding office within Church bureaucracies.

The bishops of the United States surely did not escape the dysfunctional aspects of post-Vatican II turmoil. One auxiliary bishop, given his own see in 1966, departed his superior, one of the Church's grand old men, with this parting shot: "You've led a charmed life in the episcopacy. Those good days are gone. It's all headaches from here on in." An archbishop, who throughout his career pointedly impressed college professors with the notion that he was the first Catholic teacher in

his diocese, was so rattled by what went on during the Council years, that he never again made that claim in public. Ten years after the Council, an aging staff man at the Vatican walked in on his Cardinal Prefect with four folders of complaints about what was going wrong in the U.S. Obviously annoyed, he faced the prelate with a suggestion, "What the Pope should do is fire these four bishops". To which the Cardinal replied, "You're wrong, as usual. What the Pope should do is fire one bishop and tell the world why!" *Sic Transit Gloria Episcopatus!*

National Conferences of Bishops, established by the Council without definite norms spelled out in clear language, have somehow managed to make most Catholics mad or sad at one time or another. The traditional-minded, unprepared for the rapidity of change, were the first to express annoyance. The self-styled reformers, who celebrated a few well-publicized victories over the Roman Curia in the 1962-1965 period, once they were given charge of many Church bureaucracies, grew angry when the bishops and/or Rome would not go as far as they wanted the Church to go. At the present writing (1993), they probably represent the Church's angriest segment. Unorganized Church-goers in the middle, never involved in the planning or execution of the new direction, became saddened at first by attacks on their beliefs, by the bad example of their priests and nuns, frustrated later by the awareness that those who had the ear of bishops were often willing to inflict pain on the Church, the last thing in the world ordinary Catholics would think of doing.

By 1975 the battle for the American Church was well under way and could not have progressed so far as it did without the active assistance of well-placed bishops. Some bishops came home from the Council anti-Roman, and played an activist role in how the original NCCB was designed. At the first meeting in 1966, an auxiliary bishop,

**This writer believes
that the suffering
of the Church in the
recent quarter century
is part of Christ's
on-going Passion.**

obscure at the time, rose to suggest that the Cardinals give up their places of prominence at bishops' meetings and join the ranks. And, with only one demurring, they did. But the egalitarian mood was set, for the moment, at least. Thereafter, during the controversy over Charles Curran and the alienation of Catholic universities from the authority of bishops, over the nature of religious life or the appointments to the staff of the United States Catholic Conference, the writing of the National Catechetical Directory and pastoral letters, the NCCB leadership in place took control of the Church's future direction and life style. By the end of the Conference's first president's five year term, set policies were already in place. Individual bishops early objected to the direction and to some of the appointments. In due course, various Cardinals in Rome became concerned about concessions made in the infant USCC to dissent, and to the Church's religious/academic leadership, later to the content of proposed pastorals. As a result of the 1992 debacle over the women's pastoral, where the issue ultimately was doctrinal, the American hierarchy is again at a crossroads. Does it continue its divided policies with doctrinal lines blurred and Catholic infrastructures often going off in contradictory directions? Or will it work out with the Holy See, and its own membership, a unitary direction based on the new *Catechism of the Catholic Church* and the 1983 Code of Canon Law?

The unfortunate part of trying to answer these questions is that well-intentioned believers out there think that the mission of the Church they love is already compromised, and that nothing bishops can do will restore the Church of the United States to its former piety and unified direction. Many of their kind believe that the "individualism, subjectivism, and egalitarianism", presently institutionalized, is so entrenched that nothing short of war will uproot it; that Catholic reality -Christology, Papacy, or priesthood, eternity later or holiness now - are no longer the truths vivifying the Catholic body.

Pessimism about the Church is hardly a good state of mind for leaders of any institution.

(The Church for one has survived equally great social unrest.) Yet pessimism will have its adherents as long as "business-as-usual" is the policy of government when so many Catholic institutions are at or near bankruptcy, or live on trading on the name while being only vaguely Catholic. Since many of our contemporary problems have death dealing aspects, hierarchy in union with the pope must be unified on a plan of reform and see to it that it is implemented by all Episcopal Conferences in its essentials. The words are already written down, in abundance; it is unity in action, from pope to bishop ordinary to local pastor that is the order of the day. Common sense dictates no other course.

The Way Out with the Hierarchy

The Church has always recovered slowly from major attacks on its nature or integrity, partly because it functions *sub specie aeternitatis*, partly because, at times, its hierarchy pays more attention to princes of the realm, or of the campus, or of the monastery, than to the needs of people in the pews.

Another element in cautious dealings with imbedded institutional evil may be the Church's reliance on Christ's parable of the wheat and the cockle, a counsel to endure weeds among the wheat until harvest time (Mt. 13,30). But, by no means is it clear that Christ had institutional evil in mind. He didn't waste much time Himself with the money changers in the temple (Mk. 11,15). Ecclesial penalties for contumacious injury to the Christian community, to its preached faith, go back to Christ (Mt.: 18,17), to St. Paul (Gal. 1,8), and to the Apostolic Church, not to Vatican authoritarians. Restraining, even expelling, unrepentant public sinners was frequently seen as an act of supreme charity for the community, and the offending miscreant as well. People's freedom is no obstacle to Church reform either, if it is understood as a moral ability to do what is good and right, not simply a power rightfully to do evil. There is enough freedom within the Church for

any responsible Catholic to function comfortably. Such freedom, religiously conceived, does not authorize Catholics to exercise their physical or political powers to do harm to the Church. For, in face of serious attacks, *magisterium* must exercise its own freedom to circumscribe offenders. All Catholics should feel that their freedom to worship in accord with the norms of *magisterium* is the higher value. When offenders use political freedom to cover *magisterium's* exercise of its sacred office it is a vice, not virtue, which prevails.

Church Fathers of old, to their misery, have bowed unwisely to secular forces outside or dissident forces within. By the time Trent dealt uniformly with Martin Luther (1563), forty-three years after his excommunication in 1520, the Church had lost England, Scandinavia, northern Germany; it almost lost Poland, and in France, then the eldest daughter of the Church, the seeds of Enlightenment were already being sown. Good governance prescribes that the intervention be timely. Corporations close plants, labor federations consolidate unions, federal governments ration economic activity, including information, in favor of the war effort. During the Cold War the United States created the Marshall Plan, a Berlin Air Lift, a NATO, and embargoed any Soviet enterprise liable to harm further American interests. The Church, once it recognizes an enemy, can do no less.

The way out of crisis for the Church lies with the implementation and proper use universally of the *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, Vatican II's follow-up, if you will, to Trent's *Roman Catechism*. Here is an ecclesiastical Marshall Plan of sorts, an effort by the universal Church to provide the wherewithal by which every particular Church reinvigorates its structures with the proper vision of Vatican II's Catholic Christianity, and, by means of those structures, enliven Catholic people

**The way out of crisis
for the Church
lies with the
implementation
and proper use
universally of the
*Catechism of the
Catholic Church.***

with enthusiasm for the truths that the Catechism is intended to convey. For this to be done effectively, however, pope and bishops must have overall command of their infrastructures, especially the ones which depend on hierarchy for existence. And it is already evident that, if they do not have such command, the academic establishment in Washington, D.C., Edinburgh, Tuebingen, Vienna, and sundry other capitals is prepared to undermine that

catechism. The signs of rebellion were already in evidence during the early stages of the drafting process, and again during the translations of the authentic French catechism.

What is needed, therefore, is a master plan for the continuing implementation of the sixteen Council documents codified first in the 1983 Code of Canon Law, for the Latin Church, explicated further in the Catholic Catechism, and in 1990 for the Oriental Church. The general presumption of the Council Fathers in 1965 was that their decrees would be executed faithfully by bishops, that the faith and obedience of Catholics, especially of the clergy, would ensure that the genuine meaning of the Council would be embodied into diocesan practice. This did not happen. Instead, with the passage of years, the situation has grown worse. The early nitpicking over new structures developed into controversies over Christian morality, which led to questioning the pope's role and his infallibility, followed by proposals favoring a people-based ecclesiology, rather than a hierarchic Church, eventually leading to suggestions that many Catholic doctrinal formulations (original sin, priesthood, Eucharist) need revision away from the literalism or realism that was traditionally given them by Synods and Councils. Rome has responded to all these challenges with reaffirmation of Catholic teaching. For many opinion-molders within the Church the supreme issue worth continued exploration is Christ. Is He

really Who the Church says He is? Why should anyone take as gospel what the Church says is gospel?

For the Church in the United States these are new questions, ones for which people in the pews are hardly prepared to face. The only way they are going to find their way back to the right answers, the ones they always took for granted, is to place their confidence in the ability of their pastors to reinforce the faith of their fathers. Vatican II was designed to help those faithful to deal constructively with the skepticism of modernity. However, Phase I of its implementation quickly saw deconstruction become the more common rule. Now, with the publication of *The Catechism of the Catholic Church*, Phase II begins, and the faithful must rely even more on their bishops' ability to do the job John XXIII envisaged. Unlike the deconstructionists who after 1962 sought to divide bishops, and bishops from Rome, the faithful can only count on hierarchy taking the opposite tack this time. And to this end the following steps seem to be the order of the day, if the Church follows the wisdom of its own tradition rather than the foolishness of still another hostile culture. Its ever-seeming external weakness becomes the cover under which the Spirit of God confers on the Church's chief pastors the strength Christ manifested best on the Cross, an evident sign for the believer that renewal and rebirth come through dying - of Christ first, and of His Vicars as He wills it. But in moving with the Spirit the Church must use its talents to the full, especially during a time of crisis, and perhaps in the following ways:

1. By the appointment of bishops competent to move their diocesan administration into conformity with mandated universal Church norms.
2. Through a symbiotic relationship between the Holy See and National Conferences of Bishops formalized in accepted norms clearly understood and enforced.
3. In Catholic institutions serving the community of believers faithfully according to Church norms under the supervision of the hierarchy.

1. Competent and law-abiding bishops in union with the Holy See on matters of faith morals and on fundamental Catholic discipline.

The Church's Divine Office for Pastors prays: "It should be clear to men that we are Christ's servants, stewards of the mysteries of God; the great quality of a steward is to be faithful to his duty. Many men are said to be merciful. But how often do we find one faithful to his own duty?"

After Vatican II, a devilish mythology filtered its way through the Church's educational machinery suggesting that by the recent Council's decree the Church was no longer to be seen as *pyramis* (pyramid) but *circus* (circle). The purported lesson was that bishops no longer ran the Church, but were to be situated within the community of believers, primates in fraternity, but not in rulership. Unfortunately, some bishops acted as if this was the new reality, giving themselves over to the rhetoric of change-makers, who suggest such a primacy of their own, even if it meant bringing bishops down to their level.

Even though there is hierarchy in every society, i.e. rulers as distinguished from ruled, bishops are by divine indult the rulers of the Church and, therefore, critical to the well-being of the Church. This is a Catholic given. Change-makers would have them selected, rather than appointed by the pope, but the present arrangement, a historical development to be sure, is probably the best way of protecting the unity and integrity of the Catholic faith - providing men of full faith, talent, and competence in governing are presented for nomination to the pope. Once upon a time popes and emperors handed Catholic sees over to their nephews (nepotism). That is not likely in our time, but there have always been other dangers. Cronyism is commonplace in all systems of government, as is the appointment of loyal underlings to handle challenges beyond their competence. Oftentimes there is lack of suitable

information about a candidate, or the person chosen lacks what it takes in character to cope with a difficult situation. The Latin Code of Canon Law (Cn. 378) says only that a new bishop must be “outstanding for his solid faith, good morals, piety, zeal for souls, wisdom, prudence”, have a good reputation, be thirty- five years old and a priest for five of those years. But, today, something more than a mixture of these qualities is required.

In good times simply good men may govern the Church well. But in times of crisis more than congeniality or industry is needed. Certain periods call for a Leo the Great (440-461), not a Leo X (1513-1521). The same qualities it takes to be a great president or admiral must be sought out in any bishop called to sail the Barque of Peter through the stormy seas where major enemies, inside and outside, await to sink her. He must have a single-minded commitment to the faith and act in common with the Bishop of Rome, a keen sense of doctrinal and disciplinary nuances, a talent for gathering friends to his cause and, by virtue of his personality and noticeable governing demeanor, demonstrate the courage to quarantine or trivialize the Church’s enemies, wherever he finds them. And, while it is not easy in advance to choose “the great bishop”, who is forged often in the fire of controversy that consumes less formidable officials, it should not be difficult to eliminate from consideration those who obviously give no evidence of unique governing talent or who seek power mainly for their own aggrandizement, or who are known only as hard workers.

One menace to the Church, at the present time, may be inadequate investigative procedures for identifying the right candidate, or poor judgment in choosing him. Inadequate or sick personalities, business-as-usual types, household favorites, good second men, and priests not fully committed to the Catholic faith as that is enunciated by the

**To find out afterwards
what could have been
discovered before,
especially when
the Church is in
trouble, is a defect
in the system.**

magisterium, have often made it to the episcopacy. Priests who have worked long in any diocese know the possibility of mistaken judgment, especially when the power of the sponsor takes precedence or becomes more important than the complete examination of the nominee’s credentials and potential. To find out afterwards what could have been discovered before, especially when the Church is in trouble, is a de-

fect in the system.

Some years ago an Apostolic Delegate asked me why a certain Archbishop had chosen a certain prelate to be his successor, a man whom he obviously rated as unqualified. With a twinkle in my eye I responded: “You forget it was the Holy See which did the selecting,” a case of Rome bowing to local influence. I asked another Apostolic Delegate how two others made it into the hierarchy — one a drunk, another a dissenter. The Delegate merely shrugged his shoulders with the remark, “I’ve taken care of that.” But the Delegate turned out to be wrong in both cases.

Possibly, two common obstacles to choosing the best person to handle crises are the desire to bestow a miter on someone as a favor for services rendered, or the tendency to anoint a priest who will never be better, as Number One than as he was as a second man, his proper place. One of the finest bishops I knew turned down two different sees because, as he said, “I’m a good second man”, an acknowledgment that the Peter principle does work.

The *Pax Christi* recognizes that a state of war exists at times between the Church and the world. This occurred in the days of a Holy Roman Emperor, in this century with three totalitarian states, and today with the democracies of a post-Christian West. We should not be surprised: “Do not think that I have come to bring peace upon the earth. I have come to bring not peace but the sword.” (Mt. 10, 34)

If a "just war" is imposed on the Church as a necessity it must have bishops competent to wage it. Dissenting enemies would like to name their own bishops, but will settle for appointments which do not threaten their control of Catholic institutions. For the dissenting class, popularity and cordiality in bishops are preferable qualities to strong orthodoxy and equally determined ruling style. The great bishops of the Church, the martyrs whose robes were red as often as they are white, are remembered, often in the Church's liturgical calendar, by the vibrancy of the Church they converted to Catholic norms.

How, then, does one discern the bishop with a talent for governing the Church in crisis? Obviously, he himself must have strong convictions about the Church and being a man of obedience, he seeks to implement the directives of higher authority without equivocation. (Prelates with a tendency toward disobedience, even by neglect, are undeserving of important office.) He need not be a man of many words, in fact a talent for strategic silence is often recommended, but the diocese knows where he stands on controversial issues, and that he expects compliance with ecclesial norms, if not today, then tomorrow. From time to time his actions speak louder than his words, but he knows precisely when to speak well-chosen words. The infrastructures within his direct control reflect his policy, as he reflects the mind of the Church. He is friendly with those under his supervision, but fraternizes mainly with well chosen friends. He does not do everything himself, but has one or two "vicars" who represent and reinforce his thinking. He dialogues with anyone but, as soon as he realizes there is irresolvable conflict in the offing, he moves to do what is best for the Church, even if it means pain to or criticism of himself or others. He is smart enough to recognize the futility of eternal dialogue with certain Church antagonists. He may not correct evil all at

**The effective leader
is not cowed by petty
tyrants or by
an unflattering
headline.**

once, but knows that he must correct evil, if only a step at a time, and in such a way that over a measured period good prevails, and with as little distress as possible to the community. The effective leader is not cowed by petty tyrants or by an unflattering headline. He saves his energies for the larger issues, takes time away from unnecessary assemblies to think and to pray. Many details of administration he leaves to his "vicars", because the outstanding governor of any society deals best with the unusual opportunities and/or the difficulties of his institution. He knows that talking about a challenge or an obstacle neither advances the one or overtakes the other. In situations of a grave nature, he takes counsel with higher authority, as much to clarify his own thinking, as to gain its insight.

The faithful bishop has confidence in the cause for which he works, is sure of his own status and authority, is temperate in his rhetoric, cool under fire, available even to his enemies, but courageous enough to endure the heat of battle, if his enemies declare one. He must be wise but, even if not a Solomon, decisive enough to protect the unity of the Church, certainly not to give away any part of it. Such a bishop may be hard to find, but there are candidates out there with appropriate governing talents waiting to be sent.

2. National Conferences of Bishops which function in accordance with operating procedures worked out with the Pope and dutifully executed.

Gregory the Great (590-604) once preached a homily to pastors which said in part:

There is something about the life of a shepherd which discourages me greatly. But lest what I claim should seem unjust to anyone, I accuse myself of the very same thing, although I fall into it unwillingly—compelled by the urgency of these barbarous times. I speak of our absorption in external affairs; we accept the duties of office, but by our actions we show that we are

attentive to other things. We abandon the ministry of preaching and are called bishops to our detriment, for we retain the honorable office but fail to practice the virtues proper to it. Those who have been entrusted to us abandon God, and we are silent. They fall into sin, and we do not extend a hand of rebuke.

But how can we who neglect ourselves be able to correct someone else? We are wrapped up in worldly concerns, and the more we devote ourselves to external things, the more insensitive we become in spirit.

National Conferences of Bishops, established by Vatican II and legalized by the Code of Canon Law (Cns. 447-459), were intended to situate the primacy of the pope within his collegiality with bishops throughout the world. Although these Conferences are subject to the final authority of the pope, they are also empowered to make some decisions for the Catholics under their jurisdiction, many hitherto made solely in Rome. From the beginning, a number of them have become objects of controversy, in Rome and elsewhere, over the documents they issued on catechetics, contraception, liturgical translations or communion in the hand, and over the prudence of their counsel to secular governments about how to conduct the country's domestic and foreign affairs. Disputes, at the level of the Holy See and among rank-and-file Catholics, also ensued over their prudential judgments on moral matters – nuclear warfare, population control, sex education, capital punishment, homosexual behavior, and the priestly ordination of women.

Part of the NCCB's public relations difficulties is the dissatisfaction of many bishops with procedures – too many projects undertaken at one time, preoccupation with secular affairs, de facto subordination of individual bishops to bureaucratic control, ecclesial power in the hands of committees and/or a few bishops, too many documents arriving at the last minute, overcrowded agendas at national meetings, not enough executive sessions, public debates on matters best argued in private,

little time to explore profound issues, the steam-rolling effect of voice votes, not enough voting by secret ballots, and so forth.

Unquestionably, the existence of a large NCCB/USCC bureaucracy in Washington with a \$40,000,000 budget, working in a new building costing Catholic people \$26,000,000, annoys more than a few bishops. One bishop said of the old National Catholic Welfare Conference (defunct in 1966): "I pay my diocesan dues so that I can ignore what goes on there." The United States Catholic Conference, the NCCB's new secular arm, is not easily ignored today with its ability to publicize as "official" position papers and political views about which individual bishops are not consulted. Moreover, personal interventions by bishops are often resented by a staff which owes its loyalty only to the agency's top officials. Modern governments face a similar situation whenever elected officials find themselves facing an unresponsive standing bureaucracy bound to an outdated ideology. One bishop, frustrated by what goes on in the Church's Washington complex, recently made this hyperbolic remark: "The best thing that could happen to the Church is to have a terrorist blow up that new building.

Whereas a leading USCC staffer once remarked that he had too much to do on a daily basis to be involved in Church politics, the reigning ideology of NCCB/USCC itself sparks controversy. From the USCC's first days individual bishops expressed dissatisfaction over its ill-fated negotiation with Charles Curran in 1968, and with the 1970 research papers on the priesthood, which were highly critical both of the priesthood and priests themselves. The document "Many Faces of AIDS" in 1989, and the ultimate rejection of a pastoral on women in 1992, did little to enhance the bureaucracy's reputation. Individual bishops today are criticizing liturgical translations, approved by leadership, for altering meaning rather than merely substituting words.

Because these debates take place, not behind closed doors, but in the presence of the media, bishops are often perceived as typical

American political debaters, not as successors to the Apostles. Even when bishops fine tune or reject paper or a pastoral after many years of public wrangling, the faithful have already been confused about what is the Catholic teaching they are to accept, and what represents a prudential judgment which binds no one.

The American Catholic Experience, written by Jay P. Dolan, a former priest teaching at Notre Dame, has a final chapter entitled "A New Catholicism". The

author's description of the Church there, the one allegedly born of Vatican II, coincides neither with the intentions of John XXIII, nor with the documents of the Council, nor with Catholic definitions and traditions. If his account does in fact reflect the present disturbed *status quo* of the Church, it also shows that the dissenting establishment has won a major victory over the Body of Bishops; first by maintaining strategic offices in Church bureaucracies, secondly by intimidating or immobilizing the episcopacy from counter-insurgency, and thirdly by leaving a public impression that the U.S. bishops would go further in Americanizing the Church, were it not for the reactionary policy of a Vatican Curia seeking to turn back the clock to pre-Vatican II days. Dolan's insinuation that the "new Catholicism", as described, is a superior Catholicity is belied even as he tells the tale.

In one sense "the dissenting establishment", as presented by Dolan is correct. It has won most of the major post-Vatican Two battles and the Catholic community is the loser. The appropriate moment may have arrived, therefore, for bishops in union with the pope to make a new and, this time, an effective effort to implement the Vatican II and post-Vatican II policies of the Church. If this be their will, and that of Rome, then certain corollaries must needs follow:

1. The Holy See and every Episcopal Con-

The Holy See and every Episcopal Conference must have a meeting of minds on the proper role of National Conferences of Bishops with each other around the world and with the Holy See.

ference must have a meeting of minds on the proper role of National Conferences of Bishops with each other around the world and with the Holy See. Whenever one Conference intends publicly to contemplate a departure from universal norms or Church policy, appropriate channels of communication must be used and advance agreement of principle reached, before the project is undertaken.

2. The National Conference itself must establish adequate

machinery to reflect the corporate judgment of bishops-in-the field on the choice of leaders and staff, on decisions concerning research projects, on the publication of position papers, on procedures for executive sessions and/or public meetings, etc.

3. The National Conference must strive for internal unity on matters pertaining to faith, morals, and worship, even if it includes dissuading members who use media in ways detrimental to Catholic piety.

4. The National Conference must collaborate with the Holy See on the naming and promotion of bishops, using commonly understood norms of judgment about what best serves the mission of the Church. It must be prepared with grace to be overruled by the Pope. In recent years some commentators have noticed that bargaining over appointments has taken place, called "One for Rome, one for the U.S."

5. Public meetings of the bishops must become teaching exercises aimed at informing the public and edifying the faithful. They should be conducted in a style and tone different from those carried on in typical political gatherings. In the bishops' case, the discussions should reflect scholarship, piety, and reverence for the pope.

6. The staff of the United States Catholic Conference, by directive of the NCB, should have a guiding philosophy that underpins their service to bishops, notably one of fidelity to the teaching,

laws, and traditions of the Church as this is articulated by the magisterium. Staff members should reflect this philosophy.

7. The National Conference should review how well the decrees and statutes governing the administration of seminaries houses of formation, religious congregations, priestly discipline, worship, and the administration of the sacraments catechetics, colleges, etc., have been implemented throughout the United States, and where violations of norms are evident develop a policy of reform and obedience.

It is not possible to have a pious Catholic community without the discipline that accords with the Church's and Christ's expectations. Pockets of piety are everywhere in the Church, where Catholics practice their faith, even under the most adverse of circumstances. But common discipline, observed especially by priests and religious, is what helps make piety for the Catholic masses a general rule, rather than a heroic posture. Just as private security forces help citizens find safety in a state which has lost control of its crime, select religious groups become a haven for fully-believing Catholics in a Church whose institutions no longer reflect fully its objectives or its norms.

Stability in faith and practice must be, therefore, a special obligation of 'a nation's Episcopal Conference and ultimately of the Holy See. Throughout the centuries the Church of Rome suffered from breakaway Churches on more than one occasion, resulting in special awareness there of difficulties created for the universal Church by national groupings of bishops, even by patriarchs, and of their tendency to compete with the successor of Peter. In view of this history it is surprising that the code, under which Vatican II's Episcopal Conferences have since 1965 functioned, has been so loosely drawn. This is an oversight that must be corrected during Phase II of the on-going renewal and reform.

3. Institutions which assume or are given the name Catholic must observe Church norms and be held

accountable under the supervision of bishops.

The Church is a community, but in order to be that community

She is first a hierarchy.

The Church which we call our mother is not some ideal and unreal Church,

But this hierarchical Church herself;

Not the Church as we might dream her

But the Church as she exists in fact here and now

Thus the obedience which we pledge her

In the persons of those who rule her

Cannot be anything else but a filial obedience.

Henri De Lubac, S.J.

Cardinal De Lubac, in writing the above message in his *Splendor in the Church* (p. 265), was conscious of the fact that as an academic of the Church, and one of its finest minds in the twentieth century he was subject to obedience. He did not mind obeying, when it was easy to obey, and sometimes he obeyed imperfect superiors, whose judgment at a given time he thought ill-timed or incorrect. But while he was aware that a superior's decision need not be looked upon as God's will as a vowed Jesuit he understood that it was God's will that he obey his legitimate superiors. In secular parlance, De Lubac was a "keeper of the law".

Apart from divergencies from the faith, which are occasionally involved, the major evils of the post-Vatican II Church are massive disobedience by subjects; frequently by those living under vows, and massive toleration of disobedience by superiors/ pastors responsible for the common good of Christ's family.

The Catholic Church in any given country is only as good as its infrastructures, and the quality of its pastors. Generally speaking, Christ is present in a diocese through its Bishop, the bishop is present to street Catholics through the parish priest, the classroom teacher, and various heads of other Catholic agencies. If "Vicars of Christ" are in rebellion, even in a non-confrontational way, the worship of God and the Catholic way of life, to say nothing of the faith in Christ's word, are

jeopardized. No society can be at peace with itself under these circumstances. There are no dispensations from obedience to the Church's law, especially by those in vows, unless they are specifically granted. Disobedience freely chosen, freely presumed, unlawfully tolerated, is public disorder, and massive disorder when masses are involved. Elites, be they academics, religious superiors, prominent laity, bishops, even saints, do not live in a privileged sanctuary, obeying laws only of their own making, preferring laws of the state over Church norms, following the politically correct opinions of secular society rather than the mind of the Church.

The Church of the United States would have been better served had U.S. bishops dealt forcefully with Charles Curran in 1968, rather than have the Holy See do this in 1986. Dissidence became more deeply entrenched after the original capitulation. More potential "shoot-outs" are going on today within the Church, and are almost taken for granted, because the habit of rebellion has been ingrained deeply, however covertly, in certain religious houses, schools, seminaries, even within this or that diocesan agency.

The situation can begin to be corrected only when bishops present a united front on teaching, policy, discipline, when they make it clear that, as chief pastors, they expect Church law to be observed, that they will evaluate performance of obedience on a regular basis. Once bishops put their own house in order, or have it done for them by the Holy See, each individual prelate will then find it easier to govern. It is easier to supervise participants who know the rules. If bishops fail to forge unity around the Church's creed, code, and cult, they will preside over a mediocre and divided Church. The present *laissez-faire* gives higher priority to peace at any price, to popularity over respect for authority, to deconstruction over edification. Many bishops,

**The Church of
the United States
would have been
better served had
U.S. bishops dealt
forcefully with Charles
Curran in 1968.**

too, have been led to act less as respected pastors, more as friendly equals, to their subordinates, or to appear as hail-fellows-well-met, rather than as Vicars of Christ, a role John Paul II exemplifies with unusual dignity. A bishop who so conducts himself is in poor position to deal with contumacious offenders, or to correct wide-spread evil. He tends to place high value on due process, which in fact often becomes an

undue process that leads to the cover-up of a bad situation, and deeper disorder in the long run.

Would You Do It Again?

The issue of whether an old priest would do it all over again is not the Catholic question of the year. Since oldsters cannot be born again, certainly not with the same genes or the same pastors, there is no way to know what any single person would do in another life. The more important question is whether baptized Catholics, now emigrating to our shores, would do with their inherited faith what their predecessors did - given the present circumstances of the Church. This may be an impertinent question, I know, but it is a critical one for pastors. Today's crisis has affected people first, but priests and religious radically. If the number of Catholic people at Mass goes down arithmetically because of diminished faith in the Church's divine origin, the number of priests will go down geometrically. The questions, therefore, for the Church to face boldly are the following: What do we have to say to people about God's Word in 1993 that Christ has taught, and continues to teach through the *magisterium*? (That Word is not necessarily what people would like to hear.) How do we pastors inspire faith in Christ, and worship of God through the Church, in a truly Catholic Christian way? This kind of pastor may not be appreciated everywhere, in a world filled with secular mythologies, but whose culture is far

removed from anything found in the biblical or Catholic tradition.

On the feast of St. Nicholas 1992, a well-known Archbishop appeared on public record (*The New York Times*) arguing that the Church will experience mass exodus and "reduced size" if Rome does not admit women to the priesthood. One can respectfully remind the prelate that the Church has already suffered tragic losses in the number of Church-goers, precisely because some of his peers have, to the scandal of the faithful, bowed to warnings of this kind from those who oppose the *magisterium* on many matters of faith, morals, and discipline. The Church's credibility, among those striving to maintain faith, is depleted by these forays against Christian teaching, especially when bishops are involved. Someone should remind this particular Archbishop that the Church of England has followed the route he recommends for a hundred years. Hardly more than a corporal's guard attend Anglican Churches on Sunday in that country, once totally Catholic, but considered by many today as totally secularized, far beyond anything we witness in the United States.

Church-going Catholics take for-granted that modern bishops have theological acumen, enough to know when Catholic teaching is under attack, presume, too, that they have the ability to deal effectively with those who would undermine its message and its credibility. Ordinarily laity cannot distinguish an STD from an STB, nor would they understand that many Doctors of Theology, trained in the wrong seminary or university, are not helpful curators of doctrinal integrity. A bishop without a doctorate can, and should have, a fine and informed theological mind, one that vivifies his life as a defender of his faith. The Church-goers, too, normally lead no charges against careless or offending bishops, as activists for moral relativism or radical femi-

nists do. All they ask is that bishops listen to their stories about pastoral neglect and/or betrayal. In the last quarter century, the pews have very often been right, not because they follow Vatican statements sheep-like, but because they have a keen *sensus fidei Catholicae*, which they know the Holy See reflects faithfully.

Regular Church-goers would also have little reason to know that the present theological establishment, claiming autonomy, resents the oversight of a bishop, the presumption being that he lacks the required technical knowledge. It resists, in addition, the studied judgment of an eminent Cardinal Archbishop in Rome, whose theological competence is universally recognized, as his right by office to judge the authenticity of doctrinal teaching. The same establishment today often wishes to sit on any judicial panel, as co-equals of the bishops likely to deny or limit, their members' right to teach Catholic theology, even when it departs from the *magisterium*. This very notion eviscerates the concept of episcopal/papal *magisterium*.

On September 16, 1987, John Paul II, in a personal meeting, gave a solemn charge to American bishops on the critical issue facing their Church:

The Church is a community of faith. To accept faith is to give assent to the word of God as transmitted by the Church's authentic magisterium.

Such assent constitutes the basic attitude of the

believer, and is an act of the will as well as of the mind. It would be altogether out of place to try to model this act of religion on attitudes drawn from secular culture.

One would think that, before such assent is demanded of laity it must be demanded first of the bishops, and from bishops by the Pope personally, when this understanding is challenged at that level.

**Someone should
remind this particular
Archbishop that
the Church of England
has followed the route
he recommends
for a hundred years.**

SPECIAL FEATURE

Perhaps the time has come, therefore; for pious Catholics to insist that bishops adhere strongly to an old Catholic principle: *lex orandi est lex credendi*.

On Pearl Harbor Day each year the Church prays as follows:

Lord, you made St. Ambrose an outstanding teacher of the Catholic faith, and you gave him the courage of an apostle. Raise up in your Church more leaders after your own to guide us with courage and wisdom.

AVAILABLE NOW

Church and State in America: Catholic Questions,

Msgr. George A. Kelly, Editor,
*Proceedings of the Fellowship of Catholic
Scholars, Convention in Denver, 1991,*
New York: St. John's University, 1992, 339 pp. \$20.

Contents:

*The State and Religious Establishment: Function of the
Catholic Church* with articles by Donald J. Keefe, S.J.
and Sister Susan Wood; *American Pluralism vs.
American Equalitarianism*: Rev. Francis Canavan, S.J.,

Prof. Joyce Little, Prof. James Hitchcock,
Msgr. Eugene V. Clark; *The Legal Questions*:
William Bentley Ball, Esq., Dr. Patrick Riley;
*The Catholic Questions — The Common Good,
Appeasement, Right-to-Life*: Prof. Brian Benestad,
Prof. Robert George, Rev. Paul Mankowski, S.J.,
Prof. Carl Anderson, Prof. Donald DeMarco,
Prof. Janet Smith; *Appendices*, Rev. Joseph M. deTorre,
Rev. James V. Schall, S.J., Prof. Charles R. Cechert,
Msgr. George A. Kelly; *with a foreword*
by Archbishop J. Francis Stafford.

—"Congratulations! I think your first issue of the Newsletter was a great one.

"Your editorial was splendid. The catechism is a magnificent blessing. As I read through it, there are some things I wish were otherwise: but any comments have to be small footnotes, and for a while, I think, less than that. The fundamental response has to be that thanksgiving that you end your editorial with."

Ronald Lawler, O.F.M. Cap.,
Diocesan Catechetical Consultant,
Diocese of Pittsburgh

—"I had a great three weeks in Rome, Nov. 28-Dec. 17....The Holy Father looks terrific. I think he could go ten rounds with George Foreman. He gave a magnificent homily on the feast of the Immaculate Conception at St. Mary Major's, when the new catechism was formally promulgated. Viva il Papa!"

William E. May,
Michael J. McGivney Professor of
Moral Theology, John Paul II Institute
for Studies on Marriage and Family,
Washington, DC

—"I was pleased to receive the December issue of the *Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Newsletter*....I am interested in becoming active in the Fellowship, and in attending the 1993 meeting.... I teach in a non-Catholic setting and bring at least some of the truth of our Faith to students who, otherwise, would never hear a bit of it. The support of like-minded scholars in the Fellowship would be of great value. I look forward to renewing many acquaintances."

Edward A. Lynch, Ph.D.,
Hollins College, Roanoke, VA

No Matter How You Slice It. Father Michael F. Mullen, C.M., of St. John's University, New York City, a ham radio operator, now organizes weekly broadcasts for missionaries over a network called *Project Saturn Global*, part of *The International Mission Radio Association*. For many years the IMRA has also assisted with emergency communications in times of natural disasters. Although they have been involved worldwide, their main focus has been on Latin America.

Valiant Women. The Dominican Sisters of Nashville, TN 37228-1909, with headquarters on 801 Dominican Drive, have been close friends of the Fellowship since its founding. Sister M. Assumpta Long, once the Mother General, has served on our Board. A community of 150 religious, they have in novitiate eighteen candidates, and thirty-one more in temporary vows. Most of the new applicants have entered as a result of a priest's recommendation. St. Cecelia's convent there holds three retreats a year for women aged 17-30. For further information call Sister Catherine Marie, O.P., Vocations Directress, at (615) 242-8505.

Advocatus Episcopi. One of the founding fathers of the Canadian branch of the Fellowship is a Basilian priest, Father Charles A. Ceglar, Slovenian by birth, who has undertaken the beatification cause of Bishop Frederic Baraga, the first bishop of Marquette, Michigan (1853-1868). Baraga left his native Slovenia (then Austria) in 1830 to become a missionary to the Indians. He is known for his converts and his Indian catechetical books. Father Ceglar has published

two volumes titled "The Baragiana Collection," one on the works of this missionary, the second an impressive bibliography running to three hundred pages. The Baragiana Publishing House is situated at 125 Centennial Parkway North, Hamilton, Ontario, L8E, 1H8, Canada.

What Is God Like? Father James Schall, S.J. has published a new book with Liturgical Press called *What Is God Like?* It deals with fundamental questions raised from Aristotle to Chesterton.

Marxist Effort. Father Paul Marx's *Human Life International* has its 12th World Conference on "Love, Life and the Family," April 14-18, 1993, at the Marriott Hotel, Houston. Features speakers include Cardinal Trujillo, Dr. Nathanson, Alice von Hildebrand, and fifty-plus speakers. For further information: (301) 670-7884. fax: (301) 869-7363.

Life Savers. The Pope Paul VI Institute is sponsoring a major international conference celebrating the 25th anniversary of the encyclical *Humanae Vitae*. This conference is scheduled for July 25-30, 1993 at the Holiday Inn Convention Center in Omaha, Nebraska.

The major goal of this conference is to bring people together who have been motivated by this document to work toward the promotion of sound Christian marriage and family life. There will be over forty international speakers on the faculty, including Mother Teresa, and the expected attendance is between one and two thousand people. Among the speakers: Alfonso Cardinal Lopez

AROUND THE CHURCH IN THE '90s

Trujillo, Dr. John Billings, Mary Joyce, Dr. Evelyn Billings, Dr. William May, Scott Hahn, Rev. Ronald Lawler, Professor Janet Smith, Dr. Thomas Hilgers, Ralph Martin, Gary Bauer, Rev. Richard John Neuhaus, Dr. Josef Roetzer, Dr. Jerome Lejeune, Rev. John Powell, Jo Ann Gasper, and many others.

For further information: International Humanae Vitae Conference, Pope Paul VI Institute, 6901 Mercy Road, Omaha, Nebraska, 68106.

Nota Bene. Jack Rook, our convention manager, urges members to register for the convention before June 30, 1993. There is a monetary incentive for doing so. Early registration fee: \$25. After June 30, registration will be \$50. Contact Jack Rook, Franciscan University of Steubenville, 100 Franciscan Way, Steubenville, OH 43952.

On the Ball. William Bentley Ball edited a volume entitled *In Search of a National Morality*, a book which

proposed an agenda for cooperative Christian witness in society. Among the contributors: Carl Henry, James Hitchcock, Henry Hyde, Carl Anderson, John Hittinger, William May. Publisher: Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Michigan 49516-6287 and Ignatius Press, Harrison, New York 10528, \$16.45.

Predestined. A new quarterly journal has appeared. *Providence: Studies in Western Civilization* published, not surprisingly, by Provi-

SIXTEENTH ANNUAL CONVENTION INFORMATION

Friday to Sunday, September 24-26, 1993, Orange, California

THE DOUBLETREE HOTEL, 100 The City Drive, Orange, CA 92668

Mr. Stephen Leahy, Sales Representative

Reservations: PHONE: (714) 634-4500 FAX: (714) 978-3839

GENERAL THEME: "THE CHURCH AT THE SERVICE OF THE FAMILY"

Host: Bishop Norman F. McFarland

Speakers to include:

(Detailed program will be published in the June Newsletter.)

- 1) The 1993 Convention will be organized by Mr. John Rook and Father Anthony Mastroeni, STD, Steubenville University, Steubenville, Ohio 43952, (614) 283-6318, FAX (614) 283-6442.
- 2) Masses on Saturday and Sunday, to be celebrated in the Doubletree Hotel.
- 3) Air Transportation: Forbes Travel Service, Inc., 4 North Shore Center, Pittsburgh, PA 15212, (412) 321-9700, Sandy Rim, Vice President of Customer Service
- 4) Air transportation to and from hotel — by arrangement with hotel. Regular schedule.
- 5) Convention schedule: The general sessions will begin at 1:00 p.m. Friday, September 24th, with another session planned that day for 4:00 p.m.

The Banquet this year will begin at 6:00 p.m., on Saturday. On Saturday, September 25th, the sessions will be held as usual at 9:00 a.m., 11:00 a.m., and 2:00 p.m., and 4:00 p.m.

6) Mass on Saturday in the hotel at 7:00 a.m.

7) On Sunday morning, at 8:30, there will be a business meeting for members of the Fellowship, followed by a High Mass at 10:30 in the hotel, celebrated by Bishop McFarland. Priests are requested to bring alb and stole.

Final session of 1993 Convention—Session Seven: Saturday, September 25, 4:00 p.m.

"The Family as a Believing Community: Pastoral Care of the Family". Msgr. George A. Kelly, Research Director, St. John's University, New York City.

Address: Rev. Timothy McCarthy, Pastor, Diocese of Orange, CA

Response: Dr. Richard Geraghty,

St. John's Seminary College, Camarillo, CA 93012

dence College, Rhode Island 02918-0001. Subscription \$25.00 per year, the editor is Leonard P. Hindsley, O.P. The first article by Christopher Lesch treats the moral aspects of property ownership and meaningful work for democracy and cooperative citizenship. William May contributes an essay on the relationship of persons and sex to family life.

Sound and Fuehrer. The December 1992 issue of *The Religion & Society Report* contains a lengthy essay on what it calls "the most significant intellectual movement in the United States in the 1990's" — the anti-Christian *Kulturkampf*, with the federal judiciary this time, not a government chancellor, the chief vehicle of plunder, aided by the media.

What Went Wrong? Father Steven Scherrer, M.M., has undertaken a Scripture Newsletter at Maryknoll, NY 10545. It is called *St. Jerome Publications (SJP) News*. The thrust of the effort can be measured by the contents of the early issues "The Historical-Critical Method in Biblical Studies" and "Biblical Studies: Where Did We Go Wrong?"

Saint Gennifer, Pray for Us. Father Bill Callahan, speaking to Call To Action rally, "As Bill Clinton dreamed of change even when Reagan-Bush were firmly in power, we must dream a new dream for democracy in our church."

Further Reflections. The Franciscan University Press, Steubenville, Ohio, has published *We Hold These Truths: Further Re-*

lections on the American Proposition, an examination of the thought of John Courtney Murray, S.J.

Sacerdos Magnus. Bishop Charles Maloney, of Louisville, Kentucky, a long-time friend of the Fellowship, sent New Year's expressions of appreciation on his retirement.

Of Interest. The Dietrich von Hildebrand Institute, Gardone Sopra, Lake Garda, Italy, July 1-10, 1993. For information write Dr. John C. Rao, Director, The Dietrich von Hildebrand Institute, 11 Carmine St, #2C, New York, NY 10014.

Noblesse Oblige [From Jan 4, 1993 letter from Joseph Scottino to Mr. Rook] We wish to extend the appreciation of the Fellowship to Jack Rook and his associates at Franciscan University for the \$3,624 in Convention overhead expenditures incurred by the University in behalf of the Fellowship. This generous act, together with the best of professional services provided by Mr. Rook and his colleagues, contributed to the success of the 1992 Fellowship Convention. We enjoyed working with Mr. Rook and Rev. Anthony Mastroeni and look forward to continued association with them and their colleagues in service to the Fellowship.

The Committee in Defense of Catholic Doctrine, Frank Moriss, Executive Director, writes: "You and your associates should know that a group of Catholics plans to welcome the Holy Father to this country and Denver next August with a full page advertisement in

the state's largest daily newspaper. Anyone may add his or her name and state of residence to the ad by forwarding a \$10 donation to the sponsor, Committee in Defense of Catholic Doctrine, Joan Gamble, Secy., PO Box 871, Denver, CO 80101-0871. Name and state on a 3x5 inch card or slip of paper should accompany the donation. Total cost of this project is over \$4,000 for the full page ad.

"Some American Catholic types have already objected to the Pope's visit. It must be expected that both feminists and homosexuals (in some cases the same) will make objection and possibly mount some sort of demonstration. This possibly will be linked to the "boycott Colorado" movement being promoted by various elements because of the state voters denying by amendment special recognition to homosexuality.

"It seems incumbent on as many as possible who respect and honor the Pope to make their voices 'seen', in this case, by making their names seen on such an advertisement as we propose.

"Text of Planned Advertisement: 'Welcome Holy Father, to the United States and the City of Denver. Using the language of the great Council of Trent, we recognize that the Catholic and Apostolic church at Rome is the mother and mistress of all churches, and we promise and swear obedience to the Roman Bishop, the successor of Blessed Peter (Chief of the Apostles) and Vicar of Jesus Christ. We rejoice in the Popes' teaching authority and pledge obedience to it, in particular, *Humanae Vitae* of Pope Paul VI and other defenses of the dignity and inviolability of

human life. Holy Father, please pray for Catholics of this country and for the United States that respect for human life from conception to natural death will be recovered through re-establishment of agreement between man's positive and God's natural law, as appealed to in our Declaration of Independence."

Celebrating Humanae Vitae.

Illinois Natural Family Planning Association Plans 1993 Conference. "Humanae Vitae: Celebrating the 25th Anniversary" is the theme of the 13th annual conference for the Illinois Natural Family Planning Association set for March 26th through March 28th, 1993 in Georgetown, Illinois.

Heading the list of speakers will be Bishop John J. Myers, Peoria Diocese; Bishop Roger Kaffer, Joliet Diocese; Daniel C. Hauser, Ph.D., College of St. Francis, Joliet, Illinois and Donna Dausman,

Family Life Director, Springfield, Illinois.

The topics to be covered will be in honor of the 25th Anniversary of the release of the document, Humanae Vitae, and will speak to specific sections of the document, showing their relevance in the '90s. The document richly describes the church's teachings on marriage and family life.

Accommodations will be available at the conference location, the LaSalette Retreat Center in Georgetown, Illinois and also in motels. Child care and activities for the children will be offered on site. For complete information and registration materials, write INFPA 1993 conference, c/o Mary Ann Heinz, 413 NE Monroe, Peoria, IL 61603, (309) 671-5720.

Wrong on Right. Eighth Annual Conference of the National Legal Center for the Medically Dependent & Disabled, Inc., Clarion

Hotel, New Orleans, April 15-17, 1993. The 'right' to refuse medical treatment necessary to preserve life and the 'right' to die are often characterized as rooted in a 'liberty interest' or right to privacy under federal or state constitutions. Critics of any such 'right' argue that it is without basis or that its scope should be limited by countervailing interests -- such as discrimination based on disability, questions involving competency, diminished authority of surrogate decision makers, and the obligations of medical professionals.

The dimensions of a 'right to die' and the gravity of concerns that might militate against it are even more acutely at issue in the context of active, assisted suicide or euthanasia. These are the matters to be explored and debated at this conference. The conference is especially addressed to attorneys who represent the interests of affected populations and health care professionals who serve them. Write Dean Pamela Ebel, Loyola University School of Law, Box 905, 7214 St. Charles Ave., New Orleans, LA 70118.

DREs, Please. [Note to Ralph McNerny --Diocese of Fargo (701) 235-6429]

Several members of the Fellowship are employed at the diocesan level in religious education and catechesis. Some of these are interested in meeting other Fellowship members who are likewise employed, or who are involved with catechetical programs at colleges and universities. If anyone is interested in this contact, please forward inquiries to the Newsletter editorial offices (c/o Ralph McNerny).

MEMORY

*If I ever go back to Baltimore,
The city of Maryland,
I shall miss again as I missed before
A thousand things of the world in store,
The story standing in every door
That beckons with every hand.

I shall not know where the bonds were riven
And a hundred faiths set free,
Where a wandering cavalier had given
Her hundredth name to the
Queen of Heaven,
And made oblation of feuds forgiven
To Our Lady of Liberty.*

*I shall not travel the tracks of fame
Where the war was not to the strong;
When Lee the last of the heroes came
With the Men of the South and a
flag of flame,
And called the land by its lovely name
In the unforgotten song.

If ever I cross the sea and stray
To the city of Maryland,
I will sit on a stone and watch or pray
For a stranger's child that was there one day;
And the child will never come back to play.
And no-one will understand.*

G. K. Chesterton

A Word to the Wise. The fine scholarship, much of it from Fellowship members, in dogmatics, systematics, scripture, etc. is less apparent in catechetics. For example, Thomas Groome's 'shared praxis' pedagogical method is the primary foundation for most religion textbooks and curricula; his five-step method is inadequate and undermines cognitive aspects of knowing which are so important for catechesis. (Of course, there are some curricula that are worthwhile, such as those from Ignatius Press, Daughters of St. Paul, Loyola, etc.) Therefore, would the members be so kind as to take advantage of the opportunity presented by the new Catechism? Would the members undertake scholarly research in catechetics so as to influence the textbook writers of tomorrow?

In particular, 'lectionary-based catechesis' is the latest fad; weekly lessons are based on the Sunday readings found in the lectionary. This approach deserves discussion. Perhaps some of the members would undertake an examination of this quickly-growing method.

Pro-Lifers to Meet. University Faculty for Life (UFL) will hold its third annual conference, "Life and Learning III," at Yale University on June 4-6, 1993. Featured speakers include: Fr. Richard John Neuhaus, institute for Religion and Public Life, and editor-in-chief of *First Things*; Dr. Patricia Wesley, psychiatrist, affiliated with the Yale School of Medicine, Vice President of University Faculty for Life; Prof. Steven Sabat, Psychology Department, Georgetown University. The deadline for submission of papers or abstracts is April 15,

1993. For further information about the conference or UFL, please write: University Faculty for Life, Box 2273, Georgetown University, Washington, DC 20057.

SCSS. First Annual Conference of the Society of Catholic Social Scientists, March 26-27, 1993 at Franciscan University of Steubenville, Steubenville, Ohio (614) 283-3771. Fourteen papers will be presented. Among them: Joseph Varacalli's "Catholics and Politics in Post-World War II America" and John Geoghen's "Teaching the Church's Social Doctrine in a Secular University"

O Canada. *New Canadian Magazine* (Leonard Kennedy, C.S.B.) Canada has begun a new venture in publishing with *Catholic Insight*. The editor, Alphonse de Valk, C.S.B., and several of the associate and contributing editors, are members of the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars. A contributing editor, Father Roman Dalylak, has just been named a bishop.

The magazine comes out every two months. The January-February issue has a detailed history of the gradual approval of the ordination of women in the Anglican church, an attack on the Canadian National Film Board for its documentary slandering Jesuit missionaries in seventh-century Canada, and an account of the first meeting of the Canadian branch of the Fellowship on October 17th last, with Monsignor George Kelly giving the opening talk.

Subscriptions are \$15, \$18 in the States. The address is P.O. Box 625, Adelaide Station, 36 Adelaide St E, Toronto, M5C 2J8.

In the Hen House. Matthew Fox has little difficulty with the primacy of Peter in an article entitled "If I Were Pope," which appeared in *Creation Spirituality*. Once in possession of power, he would appoint a hundred women cardinals, sentence existent members of the hierarchy to instruction in creation spirituality, turn Vatican City over to the UN and "dust off ancient liturgical texts for gay and lesbian marriages." Contraception would become a mandatory topic for homilies, children would be corrupted, the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith would go, to be replaced by a council of grandmas. The only cheerful promise is that he would resign in five years.

And we thought it unfair to think of dissident theologians as popes manqués.

The Luck of the Irish. Twenty feminists won parliamentary seats in Ireland, bringing the total to 33.

~ THE BIRDS ~

*When Jesus Christ was four years old,
The angels brought him toys of gold,
Which no man ever had bought or sold.*

*And yet with these He would not play.
He made Him small fowl out of clay,
And blessed them till they flew away:*

Tu creasti Domine.

*Jesus Christ, Thou child so wise,
Bless mine hands and fill mine eyes,
And bring my soul to Paradise.*

Hilaire Belloc

Their aim is to liberalize abortion laws and enact the feminist agenda. In New York, the mayor withheld a permit for the St. Patrick's Day parade from the Hibernians and gave it to a group that would welcome homosexual prancers to their parade. The acronym of the deviant divisions is wonderfully apt: ILGO. Irish Lesbian and Gay Organization.

Perhaps some comfort can be taken from the classical definition of an Irish homosexual: a Celt who prefers women to whisky.

Life of a Great Bookie. Otto Bird, Professor Emeritus at Notre Dame, has published a memoir, *Seeking A Center: My Life as a Great Bookie* (Ignatius Press, 145 pp. \$9.95). Bird provides fascinating accounts of the University of Michigan, where his father founded the press, Chicago, where he went after his conversion to Catholicism, Toronto, and then Notre Dame where he was the first director of the Program of Liberal Education. A longtime collaborator with Mortimer Adler and an editor of the Encyclopedia Britannica. A sample nugget: Etienne Gilson gave as the aim of the Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies the training of students who would be able to read Dante intelligently.

The Cardinal Recalls a Sacrilege.

Archbishop John J. O'Connor

It is said that the first law of nature is self-preservation. Could be. The first law of the priesthood, however, is preservation of the Blessed Sacrament, the Holy Eucharist, the sacred Body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Three years ago, members

identified as belonging to a coalition which rejects Church teaching on homosexual behavior and abortion desecrated the Blessed Sacrament in St. Patrick's Cathedral. In error, the media reported one incident. By actual count there were at least seven or eight. Some took the consecrated host in the mouth and spit it on the ground. Some took the consecrated host by hand, crumbled it, threw it on the ground and trampled on it. At least one apparently took the host out of the cathedral and displayed it in triumph to the cameras and those passing by. Much of the desecration and more was televised at a later date in a production called "Stop the Church."

It is far too painful to recall this sacrilege without critical reason to do so. There is, sadly, a critical reason to do so.

In preparation for this past Sunday, December 13th, the Third Sunday of Advent, fliers distributed in front of St. Patrick's Cathedral, where as usual I was scheduled to celebrate a Solemn Pontifical Mass at 10:15 a.m. The fliers urged people to "Stop the Church" and to "Stop" me, personally, because of Church teaching, particularly concerning homosexual behavior. Despite what I consider to be the extraordinarily scurrilous and completely mendacious nature of the fliers which demand that I be deprived of my civil rights to address matters of public policy and impugn my moral obligation to teach and to preach authentic Church teaching, I do not make a major point of the fliers. Nor would I deny for a moment the right of peaceful protest.

What neither I nor practicing Catholic laypersons can accept,

however, is desecration of the Blessed Sacrament. I am informed that, during my Mass this past Sunday, a woman took the consecrated host -- the Holy Eucharist -- from the deacon, crushed it, and threw it on the ground in apparent contempt. She made an angry comment about the improper encroachments of the Church on the "State." She was followed, I am told, by a man who received the host, but allegedly seemed to approve of her action by muttering an angry comment.

Were the fliers, the protest outside the cathedral, and the desecration of the Blessed Sacrament related? Or was the desecration sheer coincidence? I cannot be certain. Perhaps the woman is mentally ill and the man as well. I can but testify that many people present instantly made the connection because of what occurred in 1989, and urged once again these three years alter, on this same Sunday, that the Church and the Archbishop of New York be "stopped." (I wonder, as efforts are made to legislate against bias crimes," whether offenses against religious beliefs will be included.)

It is conceivable that there was no relationship between the desecration inside and the protest outside. It is certainly understandable, however, particularly given the nature of the protest shown three years ago, that many people would assume the relationship, validly or not.

The protest, however, is not the primary purpose of this column. What is the point? That when we Catholics speak of the consecrated host, we are speaking of the Son of God, the One who was born for us as an infant on the

first Christmas Day, the One who was beaten and crucified and suffered and died for us on the cross. What has He done to be treated with contempt? He loves us whoever we are, whatever we have done, do, or will do. Is He to be treated as Pilate treated Him — declaring Him innocent, but telling the men to crucify Him?

The Holy Eucharist is not only the symbol of the unity of the Church; the Holy Eucharist is the creator of unity. We receive Him in communion, union with one another through union with Him. Is the Holy Eucharist to be used to divide, to express hatred, to politicize?

I am not a brave man, and I am embarrassed to pretend to be noble, but with deepest sincerity and without hesitation I can say that I would rather be personally beaten, lacerated, stamped on a thousand times over than to see one consecrated host desecrated. In my judgment, such desecration speaks either madness, or hatred equivalent to madness, or something so inexpressible as to border on the demonic. What priest wouldn't rather be attacked in his own person, than to see the heart of our faith so abused?

I was deeply saddened this past Friday to witness the burning of St. Agnes Church on East 43rd Street. It was a beautiful place of worship of thousands of commuters to the city, as well as to residents in the Grand Central area. I must admit, however, a sense of relief and gratitude to Almighty God that the Blessed Sacrament housed in St. Agnes was saved from harm and continues to repose reverently in the parish. I say this because as Catholics we believe that the des-

ecration of the Blessed Sacrament, the desecration of one consecrated host, diminishes all of us, the Body of Christ. The real presence of our divine Lord in the Eucharist is not simply a treasure of the Church, it is our life, it is our hope, it is our joy.

My prayers will continue for those who misunderstand the Church and whose misunderstandings lead to sadness and to hate. And our prayers will continue for all of us who call ourselves Catholic, that always, and especially during this holy season of Advent, we will hold the Blessed Sacrament in such reverence that even our own lives would be willingly sacrificed to preserve it.

[From Catholic New York, December 17, 1992.]

Suffer the Little Ones. In an op-ed piece in the New York Times, Archbishop Weakland, departing from the Magisterium, called for the ordination of women. He suggested that in the meantime it would help if women were appointed to high posts in the Vatican, perhaps to the diplomatic corps, and a few female cardinals named. (Was this piece ghosted by Matthew Fox?) Back in Milwaukee, less dramatic steps were being taken. It was announced that girls would now be altar boys at the Cathedral. The rector, Father John H. Endejan, told the Milwaukee Sentinel, "We are not making any type of statement regarding our parish position or desire for women in the ordained ministry. Because we are the church of the archbishop, we will abide by the current rules and legislation of the church."

Ah, those current rules. Thank

God the rector doesn't read the Times.

Meanwhile a Milwaukee seminarian is writing a book about the non-celibate life-styles of homosexual and heterosexual priests. A *wertfrei* study no doubt. We've been keeping up on the subject in the criminal courts.

Cardinal Ratzinger Briefs the Press on the Universal

Catechism. "After the fall of ideologies the problem of man, the moral problem, is presented to today's agenda in a totally new way: What should we do? How does life become just? What can give us and the whole world a future which is worth living? Since the catechism treats these questions, it is a book which interest many people, far beyond purely theological or ecclesial circles. It can especially arouse interest because it does not merely present some private opinions invented by someone or other, but formulates the response that becomes the great communal experience of the Church of all ages.

In the catechism the question about man and the God-question are inseparably interwoven: Everything that is said about our moral conduct can therefore be said only from God's viewpoint, from the viewpoint of that God who revealed Himself in Jesus Christ. Thus it also becomes evident that in this conception of morality, we do not have just a collection of prohibitions, a list of sins. It always involves the question of how can I make by human existence upright? How can I succeed in life? On this the catechism speaks quite clearly with St. Augustine's conception of morality."

Manning Alive! No need to fear that Cardinal Manning will live only in the infamous caricature in Lytton Strachey's *Eminent Victorians*. The Chesterton Review's November 1992 issue was devoted entirely to the great convert in commemoration of the hundredth anniversary of the death of Manning, "a modern prophet and apostle of social justice."

The leading article by Sheridan Gilley (author of a 1990 biography of Newman) compares Manning and Chesterton and argues that the cardinal's social philosophy was essentially a version of the Distributism later worked out by Chesterton.

Do Manning's social writings represent an unsuccessful attempt to combine Liberal economic ideas with the Catholic tradition of social justice? See the article by Dermot Quinn of Seton Hall University.

In News and Comments there is an admittedly uninformed and one-sided discussion by Stratford Caldecott of David Schindler's attack on Michael Novak. This would appear to be the single flaw in a remarkable issue. For a copy, write *The Chesterton Review*, 1437 College Drive, Saskatoon, SK, S7N 0W6, price \$20, but note that the annual subscription is \$30 and includes a copy of the special Manning issue.

Congratulations to Father Ian Boyd, CSB, editor.

1993 Church Music

Colloquium. In collaboration with the Church Music Association of America, Christendom College will sponsor the third annual Colloquium on "Liturgical Music and the Restoration of the Sacred" at Front Royal, VA from 23/27 June 1993.

In addition to sung liturgies in English and Latin on the college campus and in the Washington, D.C. area, along with ample opportunity for reflection, discussion and individual consultation with the guest faculty, the program will feature Choral Clinics (polyphony, choral techniques) by Paul Salamunovich, conductor of the Los Angeles Master Chorale; Workshop Sessions (Gregorian chant, congregational song) by Theodore Marier, director of the Center for Ward Method Studies and head of the doctoral program in liturgical music at the Catholic University of America in Washington.

Father Ismael Quiles, S.J., died in Buenos Aires, Argentina on February 7th. He was 87 years old. He was born in Podralba, Valencia, Spain, and resided in Argentina since 1932. He began teaching Philosophy in 1938 at San Miguel School of Philosophy near Buenos Aires, and soon he became Dean of the Philosophy Department at the Jesuit University del Salvador in Buenos Aires of which he became Vice-Rector and Rector later on. He was also the founder of the School for Eastern Studies. Ediciones Depalma of Buenos Aires is currently publishing his complete works, some 40 volumes,

of which 22 are already published. Father Quiles' original contribution to philosophy consists in his INSISTENTIAL philosophy which tries to give meaning to the ultimate reality of man. Father Quiles was a deeply religious man and very active in his philosophical profession. His impact was international. He translated the entire *Summa theologiae* into Spanish.

— From Dr. Edward J. Capestany, Philosophy Department, University of Scranton, PA

The Politics of Prayer, edited by Helen Hull Hitchcock (Ignatius Press), is a remarkable collection of essays on feminist language and the worship of God. Among the contributors are FCS members Joyce Little, Bishop Sheets, Ken Whitehead, Father Paul Mankowski, Donald DeMarco, Juli Loesch Wiley and the redoubtable editor herself. There are three precious appendices: The statement on Feminism, Language and Liturgy issued by Helen's group, Women for Faith and Family, the Forum of Major Superiors and the Consortium Perfectae Caritatis; the NCCB's criteria on inclusive language and Helen's comments on it. The bibliography is great.

Catholic Insight, A Newsletter of Trends, Issues and Analysis from Our Sunday Visitor, is edited by FCS member Russell Shaw. Crisp, lively, succinct, a good way to keep *au courant*. Address: 200 Noll Plaza, Huntington, IN 46750. Tel. 1-800-348-2440. 20 times a year, \$60.

Books

Gavin Boyd, *Corporate Planning and Policy Planning in the Pacific*, London: Pinter Publishers, and New York: St. Martin's Press, 1933???, 224 pp., 35.00

Gavin Boyd, *Structuring International Economic Cooperation*, London: Pinter Publishers, and New York: St. Martin's Press, 1991.

Articles

Joseph A. Varacalli, "Whose Justice and Justice for What Purpose? A Catholic Neo-Orthodox Critique", in the *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society*, Vol. 6, No. 2, Winter 1992, pp. 309-322.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Dios Se Complace En Ti, A Spanish language edition of "God Delights in You", John T. Catoir, J.C.D., New York: Alba House, 140 pp., \$7.95.

Eucharistic Mystery: Revitalizing the Tradition, David N. Power, O.M.I., New York: Crossroad Publishing Co., 1993, 370 pp., \$29.95.

Gift of Laughter: A Cartoon Collection from 'Beyond the Stained Glass', Ed Sullivan, New York: Alba House, 1993, 96 pp., \$3.95.

How to Keep Your University Catholic, Leonard A. Kennedy, CSB, Toronto: Life Ethics Center, 71 pp.

Human Sexuality, Gerald D. Coleman, SS, New York: Alba House, \$18.95, xxii + 441 pp.

Imitation of Christ: With reflections from the documents of Vatican II for each chapter, Thomas a Kempis, New York: alba House, 408 pp., \$5.95

Jesus According To... , Facing Your Feelings, Spiritual Friendship, Hail Holy Queen, Eternal Res, My Mass, I Believe, Sexual Responsibility, Boston, MA: St Paul Books & Media.

John Paul II, A Pictorial of the Pope's Daily Life in the Vatican, Adam Bujak, San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1992, \$19.95.

Mystery of the Incarnation, Christophe Von Schonborn, OP, San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1992, \$8.95.

Politics of Prayer: Feminist Language & the Worship of God, ed. Helen Hull Hitchcock, San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1992, 379 pp.

Saints of the Roman Calendar, Enzo Lodi, translated by Jordan Aumann, O.P., New York: Alba House, 1993, 420 pp., \$9.90.

Spiritual Journey of Newman, Jean Honoré, New York: Alba House, \$14.95, xiv + 274 pp.

Totus Tuus, Arthur Burton Calkins: John Paul II's Program of Marian Consecration & Entrustment, Libertyville, IL: Academy of the Immaculate, 1992, 334 pp.

Two Sisters in the Spirit: Thérèse of Lisieux & Elizabeth of the Trinity, Hans Urs von Balthasar, San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1992, \$19.95, 499 pp.

Way of Desert Spirituality, Eugene L. Romano, HBHJ, New York: Alba House, \$6.95, xxx + 94 pp

Word and Spirit, A Monastic Review #14, Petersham, MA: Saint Bede's Publications, 1992, \$8.00, 148 pp.

~ ~ ~ HARDCORE ELEGANCE ~ ~ ~

*James Joyce, the novelist,
bragged about his minor feet,
wanted every dinner guest
to think them marvelously neat.*

Samuel Beckett also wrote.

*Admiring the master's wit
he forced each great foot down a boot
several sizes small for it.*

*He hobbled like a cripple. Corns
and blisters blossomed in his heart.*

He hid behind the potted ferns.

Work in Progress! Modern Art!

Kevin Cawley

"Hard Core Elegance" was first published in *Piedmont Literary Review*, vol. 7, no. 2 (1982).

Ramon Garcia de Haro, *La vida Cristiana: Curso de Teologia Moral Fundamental*. Pamplona: Ediciones Universidad de Navarra, S.A., 1992. 849 pp.

THIS IS an exceptionally important work inasmuch as it is a comprehensive, clearly written, scholarly text in fundamental moral theology, faithful to the teaching of the Magisterium, thoroughly familiar with the relevant literature, classical and contemporary, rooted in the Bible. It fully answers the call of Vatican Council II for a renewed moral theology — one that manifests the deep unity between the different areas of theology — biblical, systematic, moral, and spiritual. Although the work is more than eight hundred pages long, it is about half the size of Germain Grisez's *Christian Moral Principles*, a volume containing approximately the same number of pages, because the print is larger and very easy to read. The subject matter could be covered satisfactorily in a course of one semester.

The volume is divided into eight chapters: (1) the notion and history of moral theology; (2) morality and its foundation; (3) our final end and its answer to the questions raised by human persons; (4) freedom, grace, and human action; (5) the moral law, the guide to the perfection and fulfillment of human persons; (6) moral conscience; (7) human virtues and the supernatural virtues of Christianity; and (8) the struggle against sin and the need for continual conversion. Three appendices, of biblical texts, magisterial documents; and authors cited complete the work.

The special significance of this work, in my opinion, is that it is a masterful presentation of the Christian moral life as one that frees human persons from the shackles, self-imposed, of selfishness, hedonism, individualism. In the excellent introductory chapter the author provides readers with a superb understanding of the nature of Catholic moral theology — which can only be carried out successfully under the guidance of the Magisterium — and its history. Thereafter, he is concerned to show that human persons, to whom God has given intelligence and the awesome power of self-determination, can only find happiness, true human fulfillment, by giving themselves unconditionally to the task of finding the truth and of shaping their lives and actions by it. First of all, he shows masterfully that moral norms are in no way arbitrary limitations imposed on human persons to keep them under control but are, to the contrary, liberating truths meant to guide their choices. He shows that human acts are by no means physical events in the material world that come and go. To the contrary, precisely because they are shaped by human intelligence and freedom they are spiritual realities that abide within human persons, giving them their character as moral beings. Through good choices and actions human persons become ever more fully the beings God wants them to be; through bad choices and actions, on the other hand, they harm themselves more than others even if they may not be, because of the terrible ability human persons have to deceive even themselves, aware of the harm they do.

In addition, he makes as clear as day the truth that God is our best and wisest friend, the one who is ever ready and willing to come to our aid. Indeed, he has sent us His Son, true God and true man, to be the way, the truth, and the life. Through baptism we become new creatures. God gives us a new heart, pouring his love into us and giving us the virtues — the interior strengths — we need to live as his sons and daughters, as brothers and sisters of his beloved Son, whose only will was to do the will of his Father, the Father who wants us to be as perfect and as holy as He is and wills that we share in the intimate life of the triune God, a life that begins here and now, in our daily lives, and that will find its full flourishing in the end time when we rise in glory with our Lord and Savior.

He succeeds in integrating into his study the wisdom of the great spiritual writers of the Church, Teresa of Avila, Francis de Sales, and Josemaria Escriva, who saw clearly that ordinary Catholics can sanctify their daily work in the world, sanctify themselves in their work, and sanctify others through their work. He sees the Church as our nourishing Mother and teacher, God's gift to humankind, a pillar of truth, and he finds in the writings of Pope John Paul II a treasure of wisdom for people today.

The author is a master of the thought, as relevant today as it ever was, of St. Thomas. He is at home with the Fathers of the Church — Augustine, Chrysostom, and others — and with the very best of contemporary Catholic moral thought.

Carefully thought out, clearly presented, profoundly wise,

Ramon Garcia de Haro's important new study of fundamental moral theology is particularly welcome today. The Spanish edition, it seems to me, could be used in many places in the United States where a considerable part of the population is Spanish speaking. I hope, too, that this very helpful and important work in moral theology will be translated promptly into English. Good, solid material in fundamental moral theology is now available: Germain Grisez's monumental and creative Christian Moral Principles, Servais Pinckaer's masterful *Les sources de la morale chretienne*, and now Ramon Garcia de Haro's *La Vida Cristiana*. There is absolutely no excuse, in my opinion, to impose on students of theology and intelligent laypeople the superficial works so commonly available in English and, unfortunately, so widely used in seminaries, colleges, and programs of adult education."

*William E. May,
Michael J. McGivney Professor of
Moral Theology, John Paul II Institute
for Studies on Marriage and Family,
Washington, DC*

Francis A. Sullivan, S.J.,
***Salvation Outside the Church?
Tracing the History of the
Catholic Response***, Paulist Press,
N.J., 1992, 220 pp. + index.

THIS VOLUME will be of great service to teachers and students alike. It is a clear, adequately thorough, and balanced presentation of a frequently misunderstood doctrine of the Faith, viz. the famous "Extra ecclesiam, nulla

salus." Avoiding superficial judgments and polemics, Fr. Sullivan demonstrates both the consistence of the teaching over the centuries, as well as the theological development which has enabled the Church to defend the doctrine while rejecting those who read the axiom in a literalistic fashion. The author anticipates his conclusions by stating, "If I am not mistaken, what has really chanced in the course of time is not so much what Christians have believed about the necessity of being in the church for salvation as the judgment which they have made about those who were outside." (p. 12)

The book is a solid example of historical theology. The author sets in context the development of the doctrine about the necessity of the Church for salvation by tracing the theme from the Apostolic Fathers, through Augustine and Aquinas, the sixteenth and seventeenth Jesuit theologians, to Pius IX, the Second Vatican Council, and the post-conciliar teachings of the popes. He notes that the dogma was always set within the context of individual responsibility for personal sin — even though the presumption of culpability was different from what our own age with its presumptions would posit.

Earlier ages assumed that those who had heard the message of Christ and His Church and had not accepted it were to blame for that lack of acceptance; our age tends to presume that subjective factors renders such persons blameless or nearly so.

Sullivan is particularly mindful of the new impetus given to the question by the European discoveries of 1492 and subsequent years. To achieve all that he has within so

relatively small a space is no mean achievement.

The work is not without some mistakes. Despite what Fr. Sullivan claims (pp/ 37-39), Augustine never limited the salvific will of God to those actually saved. It is true that, when the Pelagian controversy began, he started to interpret the text in 1 Tim. 2:4 as expressing not God's conditional will (as he earlier did interpret it) but as His absolute will. (Fr. Portalie's old but always valuable work, *A Guide to the Thought of Saint Augustine*, pp. 228-229, gives a brief and accurate treatment of Augustine's true position.) Failing to see that Augustine was working from this distinction between the conditional and absolute will of God leads Sullivan to a misunderstanding of the great saint's teaching.

The mistake in respect to Augustine leads Fr. Sullivan to overestimate the difference between the Bishop of Hippo and his disciple, Prosper of Aquitaine. A work attributed to Prosper entitled *Libri duo de vocatione omnium gentium* is translated in the Ancient Christian Writers series, vol. 14, by P. de Letter S.J. who also executes a fine commentary on the work. As de Letter notes in his introduction (p. 15), Prosper developed Augustine's teaching on general and special graces. He did not, however, depart from Augustine's teaching, as Fr. Sullivan presumes (pp. 40-43). According to Prosper, everyone gets general graces; not all get the special graces which actually cause salvation. The reason for this disparity, according to both Prosper and Augustine, is Original Sin. Nevertheless, it is clear that — the case of unbaptized infants apart — Prosper holds that an adult

is responsible for his own damnation. And in this assertion, Prosper is a faithful follower of his teacher. Fr. Sullivan uses de Letter's translation of Prosper; he should, I think, have taken greater advantage of his commentary as well.

The difference asserted to exist between Augustine and Prosper may be what induces Fr. Sullivan to underestimate the significance of Augustine's *Epistle 43*. Written to non-Catholic Christians, it clearly sets down the principle that only those are to be considered heretics who are responsible for their separation from the truth. The fact that Augustine presumed that those who have heard the truth and not accepted it are to blame does not in any way mitigate the importance of the general principle. For Augustine the dictum "Outside the Church there is no salvation" was understood to apply to those who were culpably responsible for re-

maining outside the fold.

Fr. Sullivan's assertion that what has changed is not so much the doctrine about the necessity of the Church, but rather the notion of who is "outside" is not a happy one, and is probably due to his continuing lack of accuracy on the significance of the famous "*subsistit*" in *Lumen Gentium*, 8. Nevertheless, chapter ten of his work on the significance of the non-Christian religions is a thoughtful and clear presentation of the uniqueness of Christ and His Church in the face of those who would palliate or deny the claims of both.

It may be fair to say, also, that Fr. Sullivan places too much emphasis on the significance of the discovery of the New World for the theological development of the doctrine on salvation, and too little on the theological development of what constitutes subjective culpa-

bility. Early theological and Magisterial teaching on the necessity of the Church touched explicitly only on the objective state of affairs; later developments led to the inclusion of the subjective aspects of the questions. It was the combination of these and other factors that enables theologians and finally Pius IX to explicate what had been implied even from earliest times, and what Vatican II teaches in this way: "Anyone who knows that the Catholic Church was made necessary by God through Jesus Christ, and would refuse to enter or remain in her, could not be saved." (*Lumen Gentium*, 14).

It is never difficult for a reviewer to find inadequacies in any book which attempts — as this work does — so comprehensive a study of so complex an issue.

*Msgr. James O'Connor,
Dunwoodie Seminary
at Yonkers, N.Y.*

**Fellowship of
Catholic Scholars
Newsletter**

Box 495

Notre Dame, IN 46556

Nonprofit Organization
U.S. Postage
PAID
Notre Dame, Indiana
Permit No. 10

Fellowship
of Catholic
Scholars
Newsletter